arXiv:1406.6971v2 [math.PR] 16 Oct 2014

The minimum of a branching random walk outside the boundary case

Julien Barral, Yueyun Hu and Thomas Madaule[1]

Université Paris XIII, Université Paris XIII & Université Paul Sabatier

Summary. This paper is a complement to the studies on the minimum of a real-valued branching random walk. In the boundary case ([13]), Aïdékon in a seminal paper ([2]) obtained the convergence in law of the minimum after a suitable renormalization. We study here the situation when the log-generating function of the branching random walk explodes at some positive point and it cannot be reduced to the boundary case. In the associated thermodynamics framework this corresponds to a first order phase transition, while the boundary case corresponds to a second order phase transition.

Keywords. Branching random walk, minimal position, phase transition.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 60J80, 60F05.

1 Introduction

Consider a branching random walk on the real line $\mathbb{R}$. Initially, a particle sits at the origin. Its children form the first generation; their displacements from the origin correspond to a point process $\mathscr{L}$ on the line. These children have children of their own (who form the second generation), and behave, relative to their respective positions, like independent copies of $\mathscr{L}$, and so on. Denote by $\mathbb{P}$ the probability distribution on the space Ω of marked trees associated with this branching random walk, and $\mathbb{E}$ the expectation with respect to $\mathbb{P}$.

The genealogy of all particles forms a Galton-Watson tree $\mathbb{T}$ whose root is denoted by $\varnothing$. Denote by $\{u : |u| = n\}$ the set of particles at generation $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and by $V(u) \in \mathbb{R}$ the position of u. Notice that $\sum_{|u|=1} \delta_{\{V(u)\}} = \mathscr{L}$. Let ϕ be the log-generating function of $\mathscr{L}$:

$$\phi(\beta) := \log \mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{|u|=1} \mathrm{e}^{-\beta V(u)} \Big] = \log \mathbb{E}\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{e}^{-\beta x} \mathscr{L}(dx) \right] \in (-\infty, \infty], \qquad \beta \in \mathbb{R}.$$

We assume that $\mathbb{T}$ is supercritical and define $M_n := \min_{|u|=n} V(u)$ the minimum of the branching random walk in the nth generation (with convention: $\inf \emptyset \equiv \infty$). Hammersley [28], Kingman [32]

[1]J.B. and Y.H.: Département de Mathématiques, Université Paris XIII, Sorbonne Paris Cité, 99 avenue J-B Clément, F-93430 Villetaneuse. barral@math.univ-paris13.fr and yueyun@math.univ-paris13.fr

T.M.: Institut de Mathématiques de Toulouse, Université Paul Sabatier, 118, route de Narbonne, F-31062 Toulouse Cedex 9. thomas.madaule@math.univ-toulouse.fr

Research partially supported by ANR (MEMEMOII) 2010 BLAN 0125

and Biggins [8] have established the law of large numbers for M_n under a fairly general setting: if $\mathrm{dom}(\phi) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^* \neq \emptyset$ then upon on the survival of the system, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{M_n}{n} = c$, where $c = -\inf\{\phi(\beta)/\beta : \beta > 0\}$. Hammersley [28] raised the problem of finding the asymptotic behavior of $M_n - cn$. Several recent attempts led to significative contributions (see [1], [17], [29] and the references therein), until the sharp answer was given by Aïdékon in [2] in the "boundary case" (in the senses of [13], see below).

Due to the interplay between branching random walk theory and some random energy models in statistical physics, we find useful to describe the above-mentioned fine results on M_n as being obtained under a second order phase transition. Indeed, suppose that $\mathrm{dom}(\phi) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^* \neq \emptyset$. Either $c = \lim_{\beta\to\infty} -\phi(\beta)/\beta$ or $-\inf\{\phi(\beta)/\beta : \beta > 0\}$ is reached at a unique $\beta_c > 0$. In the latter case, with c is associated a phase transition phenomenon: define the convex functions

$$F_n(\beta) = \frac{1}{n} \log \sum_{|u|=n} \mathrm{e}^{-\beta V(u)}, \quad n \geq 1,\ \beta > 0.$$

In the random energy model introduced by Derrida and Spohn in [22] (in which $\mathbb{T}$ is a regular tree and the increments of the branching random walks are i.i.d. and Gaussian), these functions are the partition functions of the directed polymers on the disordered tree $\mathbb{T}$. They converge almost surely pointwise on $\mathbb{R}_+$ to the free energy in infinite volume

$$F(\beta) = \mathbf{1}_{[0,\beta_c]}(\beta)\phi(\beta) + \mathbf{1}_{(\beta_c,\infty)}(\beta)\beta_c^{-1}\phi(\beta_c)\beta, \quad \beta > 0,$$

(see [20, 10, 42, 43, 4]). To slightly simplify the discussion, suppose that $\phi'(\beta_c-)$ exists (this is the case for instance when the branching number $\sum_{|u|=1} 1$ has a finite expectation). When $\beta_c^{-1}\phi(\beta_c) = \phi'(\beta_c-)$, F is twice differentiable everywhere except at β_c, where it is only once differentiable; in the thermodynamical setting this corresponds to a second order phase transition at temperature β_c^{-1}. When $\beta_c^{-1}\phi(\beta_c) > \phi'(\beta_c-)$, F is differentiable everywhere except at β_c, and we face a first order phase transition at β_c^{-1}.

By using the linear transform $(V(u), u \in \mathbb{T}) \to (\beta_c V(u) + \phi(\beta_c)|u|, u \in \mathbb{T})$ one reduces the two previous situations to the case where $\beta_c = 1$ and

$$\phi(1) = 0 \tag{1.1}$$

(see Figures 1 and 2).

We assume (1.1) throughout this paper. In case of a second order phase transition we have $\phi'(1-) = 0$, i.e. $\mathbb{E}\big[\int_{\mathbb{R}} x\,\mathrm{e}^{-x}\mathscr{L}(dx)\big] = 0$, and this last property corresponds to the "boundary case" (a terminology introduced in [13]) or the "critical case" in the study of the additive martingale

$$W_n := \sum_{|u|=n} \mathrm{e}^{-V(u)}, \qquad n \geq 1,$$

while in case of a first order phase transition we have $\phi'(1-) < 0$, which more generally rewrites $\mathbb{E}\big[\int_{\mathbb{R}} x\,\mathrm{e}^{-x}\mathscr{L}(dx)\big] > 0$, and corresponds to the so-called "subcritical case". Also, since $\beta_c = 1$, due to the convexity of ϕ we necessarily have $\phi(\beta) = +\infty$ for all $\beta > 1$ in the subcritical case. Notice that in both critical and subcritical cases, the limiting velocity $c = 0$.

When a second order phase transition occurs (namely the boundary case), the almost sure limit of W_n vanishes (Biggins [9], Lyons [37]). Under some integrability conditions and in the case that $\mathscr{L}$



Figure 1: First order phase transition



Figure 2: Second order phase transition (boundary case)

is not a.s. supported on a deterministic lattice, it is known that the branching random walk exhibits some highly non-trivial universalities: In the seminal paper [2], Aïdékon proved (see also [16] for an alternative approach) the convergence in law for $M_n - \frac{3}{2}\log n$ as $n \to \infty$ towards a convoluted Gumbel distribution; specifically there exists a constant $c' > 0$ depending on the distribution of $\mathscr{L}$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}(M_n \geq \frac{3}{2}\log n + x) = \mathbb{E}\left(\exp(-c'\mathrm{e}^x D_\infty)\right), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{1.2}$$

where $D_\infty := \lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{|u|=n} V(u)\,\mathrm{e}^{-V(u)}$, non-trivial and nonnegative, is the limit of the so-called derivative martingale ([12, 2, 19]). This behavior is analogous to that observed in the branching Brownian motion (see [15]). It is worth mentioning that Aïdékon's result (1.2) is a key point in understanding the asymptotic behaviors of the Gibbs measures $\mu_{\beta,n}$ whichs assigns to each bond v of generation n the mass $\mu_{\beta,n}(u) = \mathrm{e}^{-\beta V(u) - nF_n(\beta)}$. Based on [2], Madaule [39] showed that $n^{\frac{3}{2}\beta}\sum_{|u|=n}\mathrm{e}^{-\beta V(u)}$ converges in law, see also Webb [49] in the Gaussian case on a regular tree. In the case where $\mathbb{T}$ is regular, say s-adic, Barral, Rhodes and Vargas [6] showed, thanks to [39] and the theory of invariant distributions by random weighted means (also called fixed points of the smoothing transformation theory) [40, 30, 8, 24, 11, 35, 3], that for each $\beta > 1$, $\mu_{\beta,n}$ converges in law to a random discrete measure μ_β defined as follows: Let μ be the critical Mandelbrot measure on $\{0,\dots,s-1\}^{\mathbb{N}_+}$ associated with the branching random walk, that is the measure which assigns mass $\mathrm{e}^{-V(u)}D_\infty(u)$ to bond u, where $D_\infty(u)$ is the copy of D_∞ built with the branching random walk rooted at u; let $N_\mu^{(\beta)}$ be a positive Borel random

measure on $\{0,\dots,s-1\}^{\mathbb{N}_+}\times\mathbb{R}_+^*$ whose law conditionally on μ is that of a Poisson point measure with intensity $\frac{\mu(dx)dz}{z^{1+1/\beta}}$; then define the random measures $\nu_\beta(A)=\int_A\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^*} zN_\mu^{(\beta)}(dx,dz)$ and $\mu_\beta=\nu_\beta/\|\nu_\beta\|$. All these results provide a sharp description of the asymptotic behavior of the associated directed polymer at temperatures lower than the critical freezing temperature $\beta_c=1$. In particular, they describe in which way the lower is the temperature, the more the main part of the energy concentrates on a small number of atoms.

Let us also mention that M_n plays a role in the study of the modulus of continuity of the 0-dimensional measure μ ([5]).

In this paper we seek for the asymptotic behaviors of M_n in the situation when a first order phase transition occurs, and which can not be reduced to the boundary case. We show a convergence similar to (1.2) with some norming sequence depending on the law of $\mathscr{L}$ instead of the universal $(\frac{3}{2}\log n)$ recentering in the boundary case, and with D_∞ replaced by the non-denegenerate limit W_∞ of the martingale W_n. By construction W_∞ satisfies the almost sure invariance by random weighted mean equation

$$W_\infty=\sum_{|u|=1}\mathrm{e}^{-V(u)}W_\infty(u),$$

where $W_\infty(u)$ is the copy of W_∞ built with the branching random walk associated the subtree of $\mathbb{T}$ rooted at u (see [30, 24, 8]), and it is worth recalling that the same holds for D_∞ in the boundary case (see [24, 33, 36]).

We will state our assumptions in terms of the distribution of the i.i.d increments $X_1,\dots,X_n,\dots$ of the random walk (S_n) naturally associated with the branching random walk and assumed to be defined on a probability space whose probability measure is $\mathbf{P}$. Denote by $\mathbf{E}$ the expectation with respect to $\mathbf{P}$ and set $X=X_1$. The law of X, denoted as $\mathbf{P}_X$, is defined under (1.1) by

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x)\,\mathbf{P}_X(\mathrm{d}x):=\mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{|u|=1}f(V(u))\,\mathrm{e}^{-V(u)}\Big],\tag{1.3}$$

for any bounded measurable function f. Our first assumptions about $\mathbf{P}_X$ and expressed in terms of X are the following: There exist some constants $\gamma>3$, $\alpha>1$, a slowly varying function ℓ and some $x_0<0$ such that

$$\mathtt{m}:=\mathbf{E}[X]>0,\qquad \mathbf{E}\Big[(X^+)^\gamma\Big]<\infty,\qquad \mathbf{P}\left(X\le x\right)=\int_{-\infty}^x|y|^{-\alpha-1}\ell(y)\mathrm{d}y,\qquad \forall\, x\le x_0,\tag{1.4}$$

with $y^+:=\max(y,0)$ for any $y\in[-\infty,\infty)$. The first property $m>0$ is just a restatement of $\phi(1-)<0$ whenever this derivative is defined. The second and third properties imply in particular that X is in the domain of attraction of a stable law of index $\min(\alpha,2)$ (to fix ideas, let us mention that the boundary case considered in [2] correspond to $\mathbf{E}[X]=0$ and $\mathbf{E}(X^2)<\infty$, as well as additional technical assumptions). One naturally gets a branching random walk leading to such an X as follows: fix a random variable X obeying (1.4) and assume in addition that $1<s=\mathbf{E}(\mathrm{e}^X)=\int\mathrm{e}^x\mathbf{P}_X(\mathrm{d}x)<\infty$ (in particular the second condition holds with all $\gamma>0$). Let $(V_j)_{j\ge1}$ be a sequence of random variables distributed according to $s^{-1}\mathrm{e}^x\mathbf{P}_X(\mathrm{d}x)$, ν a random integer independent of $(V_j)_{j\ge1}$ and such that $\mathbf{E}(\nu)=s$, and set $\mathscr{L}=\sum_{j=1}^\nu\delta_{\{V_j\}}$. When s is an integer, ν can be taken constant and equal to s, so that the branching random walk is built on the s-adic tree.

For brevity, we extend the function ℓ to the whole $\mathbb{R}$, by letting $\ell(x) = \ell(-x)$ for $x \geq |x_0|$ and $\ell(x) = 1$ for any $x \in (x_0, |x_0|)$ [$|x_0|$ being large enough so that $\ell(x) > 0$ for any $x \leq x_0$].

Under (1.1), it is known that on the set $\mathbf{S}$ of the survival of the system, $M_n \to \infty$ a.s. (see Shi [45]). We have the following upper bound for the tightness of the minimum:

Proposition 1.1. *Under (1.1) and (1.4), there exists some positive constant K such that for all $n \geq 2$ and $x \geq 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(M_n \leq \alpha_n - x) \leq K\mathrm{e}^{-x}, \tag{1.5}$$

where here and in the sequel,

$$\alpha_n := (\alpha + 1)\log n - \log \ell(n).$$

It is natural to study the convergence of $M_n - \alpha_n$. Before the presentation of the convergence in law under additional assumptions, let us say a few words on the norming constant α_n. For any $u \in \mathbb{T}\backslash\{\varnothing\}$, let $\overleftarrow{u}$ be the parent of u. Define

$$\Delta V(u) := V(u) - V(\overleftarrow{u}), \qquad \mathbb{B}(u) := \Big\{v : v \neq u, \overleftarrow{v} = \overleftarrow{u}\Big\}. \tag{1.6}$$

For any $n \geq 1$ and $|u| = n$, denote by $\{u_0 := \varnothing, u_1, ..., u_{n-1}, u_n = u\}$ the shortest path relating the root $\varnothing$ to u such that $|u_i| = i$ for any $0 \leq i \leq n$.

It turns out that the minimal position M_n will be reached only by those particles $|u| = n$, such that there is a unique $i \in [1, n]$ such that $\Delta V(u_i) < -n^{1+o(1)}$. Moreover, to make $V(u) = M_n$, necessarily i is near to n and this (unique) large drop $\Delta V(u_i)$ will be of order $-n$, which in view of the density function of X in (1.4), happens with probability of order $\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n}$. This will yield the norming constant α_n. However, some particles $v \in \mathbb{B}(u_i)$ could also make a large drop in the sense that $\Delta V(v) < -n^{1+o(1)}$, moreover v could also give some descendants which reach M_n in the n-th generation. To get the convergence in law of $M_n - \alpha_n$, we have to control this possibility of simultaneous large drops in the same generation. This is why we need to introduce some extra conditions, stated below as (1.10), (1.11) and (1.12). We mention that these conditions hold for instance when $\mathscr{L} = \sum_{i=1}^{\nu} \delta_{\{\xi_i\}}$ with (ξ_i) i.i.d. and independent of ν.

We also need the following integrability hypothesis, which combined with $\mathbf{E}(X) > 0$, is necessary and sufficient for W_∞ to not vanish almost surely [8, 30, 24]:

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\sum_{|u|=1} \mathrm{e}^{-V(u)}\Big)\Big(\log \sum_{|u|=1} \mathrm{e}^{-V(u)}\Big)^+\Big] < \infty, \tag{1.7}$$

moreover $W_\infty > 0$ on $\mathbf{S}$.

The main result of this paper is the following convergence in law:

Theorem 1.2. *Assume (1.1), (1.4) and (1.7), as well as (1.10), (1.11) and (1.12). Then for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}(M_n \geq \alpha_n + x) = \mathbb{E}\left(\exp(-c_* \mathrm{e}^x W_\infty)\right), \tag{1.8}$$

where $c_* > 0$ is some constant given in (5.26).

Remark 1.3. *If almost surely $\#\{|u| = n : V(u) = M_n\} = 1$ for any $n \geq 1$, then we do not need the assumptions (1.10), (1.11) and (1.12) in Theorem 1.2.*

In Theorem 1.2, the variety of possible behaviors obtained for M_n comes for a part from the fact that a necessary and sufficient condition for the non degeneracy of W_∞ is known, which makes it possible to choose X with an infinite moment of order α with any $\alpha \in (1, \infty)$, while Aïdékon [2]'s result assumes $\mathbf{E}(X^2) < \infty$ (and $\mathbf{E}(X) = 0$), which with additional assumptions ensures that D_∞ exists and is non degenerate; indeed, it is not known whether the assumption $\mathbf{E}(X^2) < \infty$ can be relaxed.

Our result makes us conjecture that for $\beta > 1$, the same convergence result as in the boundary case holds for the Gibbs measures $\mu_{\beta,n}$ on $\{0, \dots, s-1\}^{\mathbb{N}_+}$ if one replaces the critical Mandelbrot measure by the standard Mandelbrot measure, namely the non degenerate measure which assigns mass $\mathrm{e}^{-V(u)} W_\infty(u)$ to bond u. This would complete the parallel between the freezing phenomena observed under a second and a first order phase transition. The difference between these two situations can also be described at the critical temperature, and conditionally on non-extinction, as follows: under a second order phase transition, there exists a minimal supporting subtree $\mathbb{T}(0)$ for the free energy in the sense that the bounds of generation n in $\mathbb{T}$ which mainly contribute to the free energy $F_n(1)$ are those u of $\mathbb{T}(0) \cap \mathbb{T}_n$; moreover one observes the behavior, or singularity, $\frac{V(u)}{n} \approx 0 = -\phi'(1)$ for the potential V along $\partial\mathbb{T}(0)$, and $\#\mathbb{T}(0) \cap \mathbb{T}_n \approx e^{o(n)}$. These properties are reminiscent from the fact that in the infinite volume limit $\partial\mathbb{T}(0)$ is of Hausdorff dimension 0 and such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \sum_{|u|=n,\, [u] \cap \partial\mathbb{T}(0) \neq \emptyset} e^{-V(u)} = F(1) = 0$, with $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{V(x_{|n})}{n} = 0$ for all $x \in \partial\mathbb{T}(0)$, where $x_{|n}$ is the prefix of x of length n and $\partial\mathbb{T}$ is endowed with the standard ultrametric distance. Consequently, the free energy concentrates on a single type of singularity (see [41, 4]). Under a first order phase transition, for all $\alpha \in [0, -\phi'(1)]$, there exists a subtree $\mathbb{T}(\alpha)$ of $\mathbb{T}$ such that $\#\mathbb{T}(\alpha) \cap \mathbb{T}_n \approx e^{n\alpha}$, the bonds $u \in \mathbb{T}(\alpha) \cap \mathbb{T}_n$ satisfy $\frac{V(u)}{n} \approx \alpha$, and they substantially contribute to the free energy $F_n(1)$; in the infinite volume the fractal sets $\partial\mathbb{T}(\alpha)$, $\alpha \in [0, -\phi'(1)]$, are of respective Hausdorff dimension α, and such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \sum_{|u|=n,\, [u] \cap \partial T(\alpha) \neq \emptyset} e^{-V(u)} = F(1) = 0$, and at each $x \in \partial\mathbb{T}(\alpha)$ one observes the singularity $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{V(x_{|n})}{n} = \alpha$ (see [4] for more details). This can be interpreted as the coexistence of uncountably many equilibrium states in the system at β_c.

It is time to make (1.10), (1.11) and (1.12) explicit. To do so we need to introduce the probability measure $\mathbb{Q}$ considered by Lyons [37] for general branching random walks (see also [48] for regular trees) and originally defined by Peyrière [30] for regular trees and in the case where W_∞ is non degenerate ($\mathbb{Q}$ is there defined as the skew product of the probability $\mathbb{P}$ and the Mandelbrot measure μ [30] to study the Hausdorff dimension of μ).

Denote by $(\mathcal{F}_n, n \geq 0)$ the natural filtration of the branching random walk. The following proposition is well-known:

Proposition 1.4. *Under (1.1), on the space $\widehat{\Omega}$ of marked trees enlarged by an infinite distinguished ray $(w_n, n \geq 0)$, called spine, we may construct a probability measure $\mathbb{Q}$ such that*

(i) for any $n \geq 1$ and $|u| = n$, we have

$$\mathbb{Q} \circ \pi^{-1}|_{\mathcal{F}_n} := W_n \bullet \mathbb{P}|_{\mathcal{F}_n}, \qquad \mathbb{Q}\left\{w_n = u \middle| \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{F}_n)\right\} = \frac{\mathrm{e}^{-V(u)}}{W_n}, \tag{1.9}$$

where π denotes the projection of $\widehat{\Omega}$ on Ω;

(ii) under $\mathbb{Q}$, $(\Delta V(w_n), \sum_{v \in \mathbb{B}(w_n)} \delta_{\{\Delta V(w_n) - \Delta V(v)\}})_{n \geq 1}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables. Moreover, the distribution of $(V(w_n), n \geq 0)$ under $\mathbb{Q}$ is the distribution of the random walk $(S_n, n \geq 0)$ under $\mathbf{P}$ defined above;

(iii) under $\mathbb{Q}$, conditionally on $\mathcal{G} := \sigma\{u, \Delta V(u), \overleftarrow{u} = w_j, j \geq 0\}$, the processes $\{V(uv) - V(u), v \in \mathbb{T}\}$, for $u \in \cup_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{B}(w_j)$, are i.i.d and are distributed as $\{V(v), v \in \mathbb{T}\}$ under $\mathbb{P}$.

We refer the reader to [18, 38, 37, 12, 45] for the detailed discussions on the change of measure and the proof of Proposition 1.4.

We denote by $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ the expectation with respect to $\mathbb{Q}$ and introduce the first additional hypothesis which we also believe necessary for the convergence of of $M_n - \alpha_n$:

$$\text{For any } f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+ \text{ measurable with compact support}$$
$$\lim_{z \to -\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big[\mathrm{e}^{-\sum_{|v|=1, v \neq w_1} f(V(w_1) - V(v))} \,\Big|\, V(w_1) = z \Big] \to \int \Xi(d\theta) \mathrm{e}^{-\langle f, \theta \rangle}, \tag{1.10}$$

where Ξ is the distribution of some point process on $\mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ and we use the notation $\langle f, \theta \rangle := \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x)\theta(dx)$ for any $\theta \in \mathcal{M}$, the space of σ-finite measures on $\mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$. For instance when $\mathscr{L} = \sum_{i=1}^{\nu} \delta_{\{\xi_i\}}$ with (ξ_i) i.i.d. and independent of ν it is easily seen that Ξ concentrates on $\delta_{\{-\infty\}}$.

The two other technical hypotheses are stated as follows:

$$\text{Under } \mathbb{Q}, \text{ as } z \to -\infty, \text{ the laws of } \#\mathbb{B}(w_1) \text{ conditionally on } \{V(w_1) = z\} \text{ are tight,} \tag{1.11}$$
$$\lim_{\lambda \to \infty} \limsup_{z \to -\infty} \mathbb{Q}\Big(\cup_{v \in \mathbb{B}(w_k)} \{\Delta V(w_k) - \Delta V(v) \geq \lambda\} \,\Big|\, \Delta V(w_k) = z \Big) \to 0. \tag{1.12}$$

It is easy to see that (1.11) and (1.12) are not very restrictive. We shall explain the strategy of the proof of Theorem 1.2 and Remark 1.3 in the next section.

2 Outline of the proof

The main estimate leading to Theorem 1.2 is the following asymptotic tail for $M_n - \alpha_n$:

Proposition 2.1. *Assume (1.1), (1.4), (1.7), (1.10), (1.11) and (1.12). For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist $A = A(\varepsilon)$ and an integer $n_0 = n_0(\varepsilon)$ such that for all $n > n_0$ and $x \in [A, \frac{n}{\log n}]$,*

$$\left| \mathbb{P}(M_n \leq \alpha_n - x) - c_* \mathrm{e}^{-x} \right| \leq \varepsilon \, \mathrm{e}^{-x}. \tag{2.1}$$

It turns out that the machinery developed by Aïdékon in [2] is general enough to be adapted in the case considered in this paper. As a matter of fact, the proof of Proposition 2.1 (of which Proposition 1.1 is one of the main ingredients) goes in the same spirit as that of Proposition 1.3 in Aïdékon [2], namely the localization of the trajectory of a particle u such that $V(u) = M_n$. The main difference is that, while in the boundary case such a trajectory typically corresponds to an excursion of length n, in our situation the trajectory $(V(u_j), 0 \leq j \leq n)$ grows linearly until some generation k, near to n, where it makes a very large drop $\Delta V(u_k)$. To get Proposition 2.1, we shall prove that $n - k = O(1)$, $\Delta V(u_k) = -(\mathtt{m} + o(1))n$ and control the presence of several large drops in the k-th generation by using the conditions (1.10), (1.11) and (1.12).

Specifically, let us fix the threshold $\zeta_n := \frac{n}{(\log n)^3}$. For any $u \in \mathbb{T}$, let $\tau_{\zeta_n}^{(u)}$ be the first large drop in the path $\{V(u_i), 1 \leq i \leq |u|\}$:

$$\tau_{\zeta_n}^{(u)} := \inf\{1 \leq i \leq |u| : \Delta V(u_i) < -\zeta_n\},$$

Figure 3


$\alpha_n := (\alpha+1)\log n - \log l(n)$
$n - \tau_{\zeta_n} = O(1)$
$L \ll x \ll \alpha_n$
Typical path of the minimum outside the boundary case
slope = m
Large drop = ΔV(u$_{\tau_{\zeta_n}}$)
$\alpha_n - x$
$\alpha_n - x - L$
τ_{ζ_n}
n

with $\inf \emptyset := \infty$. Under the assumptions (1.1) and (1.4), we analyze the particles leading to M_n and obtain the following statement (see (5.1)): Let L and T be large constants. For all large n and for all $x > 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\big(M_n \le \alpha_n - x\big) = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{\eta_n}\sum_{|u|=n} 1_{\{M_n = V(u) \le \alpha_n - x,\, \min_{\tau^{(u)}_{\zeta_n} \le j \le n} V(u_j) \ge \alpha_n - x - L,\, \tau^{(u)}_{\zeta_n} \in [n-T, n]\}}\right] + o(1)\,\mathrm{e}^{-x},$$

where $\eta_n := \sum_{|u|=n} 1_{\{V(u)=M_n\}}$ and $o(1) \to 0$ uniformly on n and x, as $L, T \to \infty$.

By the change of measure (cf. Proposition 1.4), the above expectation is equal to

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\frac{1}{\eta_n}\,\mathrm{e}^{V(w_n)} 1_{\{M_n = V(w_n) \le \alpha_n - x,\, \min_{\tau^{(w_n)}_{\zeta_n} \le j \le n} V(w_j) \ge \alpha_n - x - L,\, \tau^{(w_n)}_{\zeta_n} \in [n-T, n]\}}\right].$$

The effects of simultaneous large drops are hidden in the number η_n, even if at first sight this is not obvious. Write $k := \tau^{(w_n)}_{\zeta_n} \in [n-T, n]$. A crucial step in the localization of minimal particles, stated as Proposition 5.1, says that under (1.1), (1.4) and (1.7), for any $|u| = n$ such that $V(u) = M_n$, necessarily $u_{k-1} = w_{k-1}$, i.e., the trajectory of the particle u and the spine coincide at least until the generation $k-1$. Consequently, η_n will only depend on the subtree rooted at w_{k-1}. By the Markov property of the branching random walk under the probability $\mathbb{Q}$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\big(M_n \le \alpha_n - x\big) \\
&= \sum_{k=n-T}^{n} \mathrm{e}^{\alpha_n - x}\, \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\left[1_{\{\tau^{(w_k)}_{\zeta_n} = k,\, V(w_k) \ge y\}} F^{(L)}_{n-k}\Big(V(w_k) - y,\, \sum_{v \in \mathbb{B}(w_k)} \delta_{\{\Delta V(w_k) - \Delta V(v)\}}\Big)\right] + o(1)\,\mathrm{e}^{-x},
\end{aligned}$$

with some measurable function $F_j^{(L)}$ defined in (5.19) and $y := \alpha_n - x - L$. The next step will be an application of (1.10) [note that $\Delta V(w_k) \le -\zeta_n \to -\infty$] to get rid of the point measure $\sum_{v\in\mathbb{B}(w_k)} \delta_{\{\Delta V(w_k)-\Delta V(v)\}}$. Because of the compact support condition in (1.10), we have to show that in this point measure, we can restrict ourselves to those $v \in \mathbb{B}(w_k)$ such that $|\Delta V(w_k) - \Delta V(v)|$ remains smaller than λ, with $\lambda > 0$. The hypotheses (1.11) and (1.12) are introduced to overcome this technical difficulty, as shown in the proof of Claim 5.2. Thus we get the truncated version of the above equality for $\mathbb{P}\big(M_n \le \alpha_n - x\big)$ in (5.18), and an application of (1.10) gives that

$$\mathbb{P}(M_n \le \alpha_n - x) = \mathrm{e}^{\alpha_n - x} \sum_{j=0}^{T-1} \mathbf{E}\left[1_{\{\tau_{\zeta_n}=n-j, S_{n-j}\ge y\}}\, G_j^{(\lambda,L)}(S_{n-j} - y,\ X_{n-j})\right] + o(1)\,\mathrm{e}^{-x},$$

where the measure function $G_j^{(\lambda,L)}(\cdot,\cdot)$ is defined in (5.20) and we have used the fact that under $\mathbb{Q}$, $(V(w_k), k \ge 0)$ is distributed as the random walk $(S_k, k \ge 0)$. Finally, we apply a renewal result (Lemma 3.6) and get Proposition 2.1 by letting $\lambda, T, L \to \infty$.

Plainly, if $\eta_n = 1$ a.s., then there is no effect coming from the possible simultaneous large drops and we get Proposition 2.1 without the assumptions (1.10), (1.11) and (1.12), as stated in Remark 1.3.

Theorem 1.2 follows from Proposition 2.1, exactly as the main result in Aïdékon [2] follows from an analogous, though different, proposition (pp. 1405–1407). However, we give a proof for reader's convenience.

Proof of Theorem 1.2 as a consequence of Proposition 2.1: For $B \ge 0$ define

$$\mathcal{Z}[B] = \{u \in \mathbb{T} : V(u) \ge B,\ V(u_k) < B,\ \forall k < |u|\}$$

In the sense of [34] this is a very simple optional line and one has $\lim_{B\to\infty} \sum_{u\in\mathcal{Z}[B]} \mathrm{e}^{-V(u)} = W_\infty$.

For $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and $0 \le k \le n$, let $\Phi_{k,n} : x \ge 0 \mapsto \mathbb{P}(M_{n-k} < \alpha_n - x)$.

Fix $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, c_*)$. Let $A(\varepsilon)$ and $n_0(\varepsilon)$ be defined as in Proposition 2.1. Let $B > A(\varepsilon) + 2|x|$ such that $(c_* + \varepsilon)\mathrm{e}^{-B/2} < 1$. Let $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}_+$ such that $n_0 \ge n_0(\varepsilon)$ and

$$\forall n \ge n_0,\ \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y}_{B,n}) \ge 1 - \varepsilon,$$

where

$$\mathcal{Y}_{B,n} = \{A(\varepsilon) \le V(u) - x \le \frac{n}{\log n},\ \forall u \in \mathcal{Z}[B]\} \cap \{\max\{|u| : u \in \mathcal{Z}[B]\} \le n - n_0(\varepsilon)\}.$$

Now for $n \ge n_0$ write

$$\mathbb{P}(M_n \ge \alpha_n + x) \ge \mathbb{P}(M_n \ge \alpha_n + x, \mathcal{Y}_{B,n}) = \mathbb{E}\Big(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{Y}_{B,n}} \prod_{u\in\mathcal{Z}[B]} (1 - \Phi_{|u|,n}(V(u) - x))\Big),$$

where we have used the conditional expectation along the stopping line. By construction we can apply Proposition 2.1 to each term of the product and get

$$\mathbb{P}(M_n \ge \alpha_n + x) \ge \mathbb{E}\Big(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{Y}_{B,n}} \prod_{u\in\mathcal{Z}[B]} (1 - (c_* + \varepsilon)\mathrm{e}^{x - V(u)})\Big) \ge \mathbb{E}\Big(\prod_{u\in\mathcal{Z}[B]} (1 - (c_* + \varepsilon)\mathrm{e}^{x - V(u)})\Big) - \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y}_{B,n}^c).$$

This yields

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}(M_n \ge \alpha_n + x) \ge \mathbb{E}\Big(\prod_{u\in\mathcal{Z}[B]} (1 - (c_* + \varepsilon)\mathrm{e}^{x - V(u)})\Big) - \varepsilon.$$

Moreover, since $\max\{\mathrm{e}^{-V(u)} : u \in \mathcal{Z}[B]\}$ tend a.s. to 0 as $B \to \infty$, we have $\lim_{B\to\infty} \sum_{u\in\mathcal{Z}[B]} \log(1 - (c_* + \varepsilon)\mathrm{e}^{x-V(u)}) = -(c_* + \varepsilon)\mathrm{e}^x W_\infty$ hence by dominated convergence

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}(M_n \geq \alpha_n + x) \geq \mathbb{E}(\exp(-(c_* + \varepsilon)\mathrm{e}^x W_\infty)) - \varepsilon,$$

and letting ε tend to 0 yields the desired lower bound. To get the upper bound, write

$$\mathbb{P}(M_n \geq \alpha_n + x) \leq \mathbb{P}(M_n \geq \alpha_n + x, \mathcal{Y}_{B,n}) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y}^c_{B,n}).$$

Following the same lines as above we get

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}(M_n \geq \alpha_n + x) \leq \mathbb{E}\Big(\prod_{u\in\mathcal{Z}[B]} (1 - (c_* - \varepsilon)\mathrm{e}^{x-V(u)})\Big) + \varepsilon,$$

and conclude as for the lower bound. □

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: In Section 3, we collect some preliminary estimates on the one-dimensional random walk (S_n), whereas we prove Proposition 1.1 in Section 4. Section 5 will use (1.10), (1.11) and (1.12) to prove Proposition 2.1 by admitting a localization Lemma 6.1. In Section 6, we give the proof of Lemma 6.1.

Throughout the text, we denote by K, K' and K'' possibly with several subscripts, some positive constants whose values may change from one paragraph to another one. We also wrote $f(n) \sim g(n)$ if $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{f(n)}{g(n)} = 1$.

3 Preliminaries on the one-dimensional random walk (S_n).

Recall that we considered in the introduction a sequence of i.i.d. real-valued random variables $(X_i)_{i\geq 1}$ of common distribution that of X, and the random walk (S_n) defined as $S_n := S_0 + X_1 + \ldots + X_n$ for any $n \geq 1$ with $S_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $\overline{S}_n := \max_{0\leq k\leq n} S_k$ and $\underline{S}_n := \min_{0\leq k\leq n} S_k$. For $x \in \mathbb{R}$, denote the distribution of (S_n) by $\mathbf{P}_x$ if $S_0 = x$ and $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}_0$. We state some known facts as lemmas:

Lemma 3.1 ([21], pp. 1950, Lemma 2.1)**.** *Let (S_n) be a one-dimensional random walk satisfying that $\mathbf{E}[|S_1|^b] < \infty$ for $b > 1$. Let $\mathtt{m} := \mathbf{E}(S_1)$. There exists a constant $K = K_b > 0$ such that for all $n \geq 1$, $y \geq n^{\max(\frac{1}{b},\frac{1}{2})}$ and $x > 0$,*

$$\mathbf{P}(S_n - \mathtt{m}\, n \leq -x, \min_{1\leq i\leq n} X_i \geq -y) \leq K\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{x}{y}}, \tag{3.1}$$

$$\mathbf{P}(|S_n - \mathtt{m}\, n| \geq x, \max_{1\leq i\leq n} |X_i| \leq y) \leq K\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{x}{y}}. \tag{3.2}$$

Lemma 3.2 (Gut [27], Theorem 6.2, pp. 93)**.** *Let S be a one-dimensional random walk with positive mean $\mathtt{m}$ starting from 0. Let*

$$R(x) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}\Big(\overline{S}_n \leq x\Big), \qquad x \geq 0.$$

Then

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{R(x)}{x} = \mathtt{m}\,.$$

Lemma 3.3 (Stone [46]). *Assume (1.4). There exists some slowly varying function ℓ_1 such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\hbar > 0$ and $n \geq 1$,*

$$\mathbf{P}\Big(S_n \in [x, x+\hbar]\Big) \leq \hbar\, n^{-\max(1/\alpha,1/2)} \ell_1(n).$$

We mention that up to a multiplicative constant, ℓ_1 only depends on the truncated second moment of S_1, see Vatutin and Wachtel [47]. In particular, if $\alpha > 2$, we may choose $\ell_1 \equiv K$ for some positive constant large enough.

Let us introduce the drops in the random walk (S_n): for $\zeta > 0$, define

$$\tau_\zeta := \inf\{j \geq 1 : X_j < -\zeta\}, \tag{3.3}$$

$$\tau_\zeta^{(2)} := \inf\{j > \tau_\zeta : X_j < -\zeta\}, \tag{3.4}$$

the first and the second drop of size ζ. We shall consider $\zeta \in [\frac{\zeta_n}{4}, 4\zeta_n]$ with

$$\zeta_n := \frac{n}{(\log n)^3}, \qquad n \geq 2. \tag{3.5}$$

Lemma 3.4. *Assume (1.4). There exists some constant $K > 0$ such that for all $n \geq 2$, $-\infty < y \leq \frac{\mathtt{m}}{2} n$,*

$$\mathbf{P}\left(S_n - y \in [0,1]\right) \leq K\, n^{-\alpha} \ell(n).$$

Proof of Lemma 3.4: It is enough to consider large n. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}\left(S_n - y \in [0,1]\right) &\leq \mathbf{P}(S_n - y \leq 1,\, \tau_{\zeta_n} > n) + \mathbf{P}(S_n - y \in [0,1], \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(2)} \leq n) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{P}(S_n - y \in [0,1],\, \tau_{\zeta_n} = i, \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(2)} > n) \\ &=: A_{(3.6)} + B_{(3.6)} + C_{(3.6)}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

For any $y \leq \frac{\mathtt{m}}{2} n$,

$$A_{(3.6)} \leq \mathbf{P}(S_n - \mathtt{m}\, n \leq 1 - \frac{\mathtt{m}}{2} n, \tau_{\zeta_n} > n) \leq K \mathrm{e}^{-(\frac{\mathtt{m}}{2} n - 1)/\zeta_n} \leq \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\mathtt{m}}{3}(\log n)^3}, \tag{3.7}$$

where we have applied Lemma 3.1 to get the second inequality in (3.7). For $B_{(3.6)}$, we deduce from Lemma 3.3 that

$$\begin{aligned} B_{(3.6)} &= \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} \mathbf{P}\Big(\tau_{\zeta_n} = i, \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(2)} = j, S_n - y \in [0,1]\Big) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} \mathbf{P}\Big(\tau_{\zeta_n} = i, \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(2)} = j\Big)\, (n-j+1)^{-\max(1/\alpha,1/2)} \ell_1(n-j+1) \\ &\leq n \times \zeta_n^{-2\alpha} \ell(\zeta_n)^2\, n^{1-\max(1/\alpha,1/2)} \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \ell_1(k) = o(n^{-\alpha}), \end{aligned}$$

since $2 - \alpha - \max(1/\alpha, 1/2) < 0$. Finally for all $n \geq 2$, let

$$E_i^{(n)} := \Big\{|S_n - X_i - \mathtt{m}\,(n-1)| \leq \frac{n}{\log n}\Big\}, \qquad 1 \leq i \leq n. \tag{3.8}$$

Observe that for any $\frac{\zeta_n}{4} \le \zeta \le 4\zeta_n$[2] and $1 \le i \le n$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{P}\Big(\tau_\zeta = i,\, \tau_\zeta^{(2)} > n,\, (E_i^{(n)})^c\Big)\\
&= \mathbf{P}\Big(\tau_\zeta = n,\, (E_n^{(n)})^c\Big)\\
&= \mathbf{P}\left(X_n < -\zeta\right)\mathbf{P}\Big(\min_{1\le j\le n-1} X_j \ge -\zeta,\, |S_{n-1} - \mathtt{m}\,(n-1)| > \frac{n}{\log n}\Big)\\
&\le \zeta^{-\alpha}\,\ell(\zeta)\left(\mathbf{P}\Big(\max_{1\le j\le n-1} X_j \ge \zeta\Big) + \mathbf{P}\Big(\max_{1\le j\le n-1} |X_j| \le \zeta,\, |S_{n-1} - \mathtt{m}\,(n-1)| > \frac{n}{\log n}\Big)\right)\\
&\le \zeta^{-\alpha}\,\ell(\zeta)\Big(n\zeta^{-\gamma}\mathbf{E}[(X^+)^\gamma] + K\,\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{n}{\zeta\log n}}\Big) \qquad \text{(by using (1.4) and (3.2))}\\
&\le n^{-(\alpha+\gamma-1)}\ell_2(n), \qquad (3.9)
\end{aligned}$$

with some slowly varying function ℓ_2. Using the exchangeability,

$$\begin{aligned}
C_{(3.6)} &= n\,\mathbf{P}\Big(X_n < -\zeta_n, S_n - y \in [0,1], \tau_{\zeta_n} = n\Big)\\
&\le n^{-(\alpha+\gamma-2)}\ell_2(n) + n\,\mathbf{E}\Big[1_{E_n^{(n)}}\mathbf{P}\big(X_n + s - y \in [0,1], X_n < -\zeta\big)\big|_{s=S_{n-1}}\Big],
\end{aligned}$$

by using the independence of X_n and S_{n-1}. Notice that

$$\sup_{x\le -\frac{\mathtt{m}}{3}n} \frac{\ell(x)}{|x|^{\alpha+1}} \le (1+o(1))\ell(n)\big(\frac{\mathtt{m}}{3}n\big)^{-\alpha-1} \le K\,\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n}, \qquad (3.10)$$

by using Karamata's representation for the slowly varying function ℓ. On $E_n^{(n)}$, $y - S_{n-1} \le -\frac{\mathtt{m}}{2}n + m + \frac{n}{\log n} \le -\frac{\mathtt{m}}{3}n - 1$. It follows from (1.4) and (3.10) that on $E_n^{(n)}$, uniformly for $s = S_{n-1}$, $\mathbf{P}\big(X_n + s - y \in [0,1]\big) \le (1+o(1))\ell(n)\big(\frac{\mathtt{m}}{3}n\big)^{-\alpha-1}$, which implies that for all large n, $C_{(3.6)} \le \big(\frac{\mathtt{m}}{3}\big)^{-\alpha-1}(1+o(1))n^{-\alpha}\ell(n)$. Lemma 3.4 follows from (3.6). □

Recall that $\alpha_n = (\alpha+1)\log n - \log\ell(n)$.

Lemma 3.5. *Assume (1.4). There exist $K > 0$ and some slowly varying function $\ell_3 \ge 1$ such that for all large $n \ge n_0$, $\forall\,\zeta \in [\frac{\zeta_n}{4}, 4\zeta_n]$, $a \le \frac{n}{\log n}$, we have that*

$$\mathbf{P}\left(S_n - y \in [a, a+1],\, \min_{\tau_\zeta \le j \le n} S_j \ge y,\, \tau_\zeta^{(2)} \le n\right) \le R(a+1)\,n^{1-\max(1/\alpha,1/2)-2\alpha}\,\ell_3(n), \qquad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}, \qquad (3.11)$$

whereas for all $-\infty < y < \frac{\mathtt{m}}{2}n$,

$$\mathbf{P}\left(S_n - y \in [a, a+1],\, \min_{\tau_\zeta \le j \le n} S_j \ge y,\, \tau_\zeta \le n < \tau_\zeta^{(2)}\right) \le K\,R(a+1)\,\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n}. \qquad (3.12)$$

Moreover, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists some $\lambda = \lambda(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that for all $-\infty < y < \frac{\mathtt{m}}{2}n$,

$$\mathbf{P}\left(S_n - y \in [a, a+1],\, \min_{\tau_\zeta \le j \le n} S_j \ge y,\, |S_n - S_{\tau_\zeta}| > \lambda, \tau_\zeta \le n\right) \le \varepsilon\,\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n}. \qquad (3.13)$$

[2] We consider ζ instead of ζ_n for the use of (3.9) in the proof of Lemma 3.5; Moreover, by exchangeability, the probability $\mathbf{P}(\tau_\zeta = i,\, \tau_\zeta^{(2)} > n,\, (E_i^{(n)})^c)$ does not depend on i.

The similar results hold if we replace the interval $[a, a+1]$ by $[a, a+\hbar]$ with an arbitrary positive constant $\hbar$.

Proof of Lemma 3.5. We shall prove that for any $1 \le i < n$,

$$\mathbf{P}\Big(S_n - y \in [a, a+1],\ \min_{\tau_\zeta \le j \le n} S_j \ge y,\ \tau_\zeta = i,\ \tau_\zeta^{(2)} \le n\Big) \le R(a+1)\, i^{-\max(1/\alpha, 1/2)}\, n^{-2\alpha}\, \ell_3(n), \qquad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{3.14}$$

whereas for all $-\infty < y < \frac{\mathtt{m}}{2} n$,

$$\mathbf{P}\Big(S_n - y \in [a, a+1],\ \min_{\tau_\zeta \le j \le n} S_j \ge y,\ \tau_\zeta = i,\ \tau_\zeta^{(2)} > n\Big) \le K\, \mathbf{P}\Big(\overline{S}_{n-i+1} \le a+1\Big)\, \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n} + n^{-(\alpha+\gamma-1)} \ell_3(n). \tag{3.15}$$

Clearly, up to a multiplicative constant, (3.11) and (3.12) follow from (3.14) and (3.15) by taking the sum over $i \in 1, 2, ..., n-1$.

Let us denote by $\mathbf{P}_{(3.14)}(i)$ the probability term in (3.14). By considering the time-reversal random walk $(S_n - S_{n-k},\ 0 \le k \le n) \overset{(d)}{=} (S_k,\ 0 \le k \le n)$, we get that for any $1 \le i \le n-1$, $(S_n, \min_{\tau_\zeta \le j \le n} S_j, \{\tau_\zeta = i < \tau_\zeta^{(2)} \le n\})$ has the same distribution as $(S_n, S_n - \overline{S}_{\sigma_n}, \{\sigma_n = n-i+1 > \tau_\zeta\})$, where $\sigma_n := \max\{k \in [1, n],\ X_k < -\zeta\}$ (with the usual convention $\max \emptyset := 0$). It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{P}_{(3.14)}(i) &= \mathbf{P}\left(S_n - y \in [a, a+1],\ \overline{S}_{n-i+1} \le S_n - y,\ \sigma_n = n-i+1 > \tau_\zeta\right) \\
&\le \mathbf{P}\left(S_n - y \in [a, a+1],\ \overline{S}_{n-i} \le a+1\,,\ X_{n-i+1} < -\zeta,\ \tau_\zeta < n-i+1\right) \\
&= \mathbf{E}\left[1_{\{X_{n-i+1} < -\zeta,\, \tau_\zeta < n-i+1, \overline{S}_{n-i+1} \le a+1\}}\, \mathbf{P}_{S_{n-i+1}}\left(S_{i-1} - y \in [a, a+1]\right)\right],
\end{aligned}$$

by the Markov property at $n-i+1$. Set $g(i) = \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbf{P}_z\big(S_i - y \in [a, a+1]\big)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{P}_{(3.14)}(i) &\le g(i-1)\, \mathbf{P}\Big(X_{n-i+1} < -\zeta,\ \tau_\zeta < n-i, \overline{S}_{n-i} \le a+1\Big) \\
&\le g(i-1) \sum_{1 \le j < n-i} \mathbf{P}\left(X_{n-i} < -\zeta, X_j < -\zeta,\ \overline{S}_{j-1} \le a+1\right) \\
&= g(i-1)\, \mathbf{P}\left(X < -\zeta\right)^2 \sum_{1 \le j < n-i} \mathbf{P}\left(\overline{S}_{j-1} \le a+1\right) \\
&\le g(i-1)\, \zeta^{-2\alpha}\, \ell(\zeta)^2\, R(a+1)\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

for all large n. According to Stone's local limit theorem (Lemma 3.3), there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for $i \ge 2$ one has $g(i-1) \le i^{-\max(1/\alpha, 1/2)} \ell_1(i)$, and since $g(0) \le 1$, C can be chosen so that $g(0) \le C\ell_1(1)$. This yields (3.14) as we shall choose

$$\ell_3(n) := \max(\ell_2(n), 4^{2\alpha}\, (\log n)^{6\alpha} \max_{1 \le i \le n,\, \frac{\zeta_n}{4} \le \zeta \le 4\zeta_n} C\, \ell_1(i) \ell(\zeta)^2),$$

where $\ell_2(n)$ is the slowly varying function appeared in (3.9).

To prove (3.15), we first establish an inequality implying that when $S_n = o(n)$, with a big probability there is a unique large drop X_{τ_ζ} before n which is of order of magnitude $-\mathtt{m}\, n$. Recall (3.8) for the definition of $E_i^{(n)}$. Define for any $i \in [1, n]$,

$$\mathbf{P}_{(3.17)}(i) := \mathbf{P}\Big(S_n - y \in [a, a+1],\ \min_{i \le j \le n} S_j \ge y,\ \tau_\zeta = i,\ \tau_\zeta^{(2)} > n,\ E_i^{(n)}\Big). \tag{3.17}$$

In view of (3.9), (3.15) will follow if we can prove that

$$\mathbf{P}_{(3.17)}(i) \le K\,\mathbf{P}\left(\overline{S}_{n-i+1} \le a+1\right)\,\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n}. \tag{3.18}$$

By conditioning on $\sigma\{X_j, 1 \le j \le n, j \ne i\}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P}_{(3.17)}(i) &\le \mathbf{P}\Big(S_n - \min_{i\le j\le n} S_j \le a+1\,, S_n - y \in [a, a+1], E_i^{(n)}\Big)\\ &= \mathbf{E}\Big[1_{\{S_n - \min_{i\le j\le n} S_j \le a+1\,, E_i^{(n)}\}}\mathbf{P}\big(X_i + t - y \in [a, a+1]\big)\big|_{t=S_n - X_i}\Big].\end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

On $E_i^{(n)}$, $|t - \mathtt{m}\,(n-1)| \le \frac{n}{\log n}$, then $z \equiv a+1+y-t \le -\frac{\mathtt{m}}{3}n$ for all large $n \ge n_0$ and uniformly for all $a \le \frac{n}{\log n}$ and $y < \frac{\mathtt{m}}{2}n$, hence it follows from (1.4) and (3.10) that

$$\mathbf{P}_{(3.17)}(i) \le K\,\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n}\,\mathbf{P}\Big(S_n - \min_{i\le j\le n} S_j \le a+1\,, E_i^{(n)}\Big),$$

which yields (3.18) by using the fact that $\mathbf{P}(S_n - \min_{i\le j\le n} S_j \le a+1) = \mathbf{P}(\overline{S}_{n-i+1} \le a+1)$. This completes the proof of (3.15).

Remark that in (3.19), if we replace the event $\{S_n - \min_{i\le j\le n} S_j \le a+1\}$ by $\{|S_n - S_i| > \lambda\}$ with $\lambda > 0$, then for any $i \in [1, n]$,

$$\mathbf{P}\Big(|S_n - S_i| > \lambda\,, S_n - y \in [a, a+1], E_i^{(n)}\Big) \le K\,\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n}\,\mathbf{P}(|S_n - S_i| > \lambda). \tag{3.20}$$

Denote by $\mathbf{P}_{(3.13)}$ the probability term in (3.13). Notice that by (3.11), the probability that the event in (3.13) holds together with $\{\tau_\zeta^{(2)} \le n\}$ is bounded by $R(a+1)n^{1-\max(1/\alpha,1/2)-2\alpha}\,\ell_3(n) \le \frac{\varepsilon}{4}\,\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n}$ for all large $n \ge n_0(\varepsilon)$. On the other hand, we deduce from (3.15) that for some large but fixed integer $k = k(\varepsilon, a)$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbf{P}\left(S_n - y \in [a, a+1],\ \min_{\tau_\zeta \le j \le n} S_j \ge y,\ \tau_\zeta < n-k,\ \tau_\zeta^{(2)} > n\right)\\ \le\ & K\sum_{j=k}^{\infty}\mathbf{P}\left(\overline{S}_j \le a+1\right)\,\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n} + n^{1-(\alpha+\gamma-1)}\ell_3(n)\\ \le\ & \frac{\varepsilon}{4}\,\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n},\end{aligned}$$

for all $n \ge n_1(\varepsilon)$ [recalling that $\gamma > 3$]. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P}_{(3.13)} &\le \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\,\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n} + \mathbf{P}\left(S_n - y \in [a, a+1], |S_n - S_{\tau_\zeta}| > \lambda, n-k \le \tau_\zeta \le n < \tau_\zeta^{(2)}\right)\\ &\le \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\,\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n} + (k+1)\,n^{-(\alpha+\gamma-1)}\ell_2(n) + \sum_{i=n-k}^{n}\mathbf{P}\left(S_n - y \in [a, a+1], |S_n - S_{\tau_\zeta}| > \lambda, \tau_\zeta = i, E_i^{(n)}\right),\end{aligned}$$

by applying (3.9) to $i = n, n-1, ..., n-k$. Since $\gamma > 3$, $(k+1)\,n^{-(\alpha+\gamma-1)}\ell_2(n) \le \frac{\varepsilon}{4}\,\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n}$, which in view of (3.20) imply that $\mathbf{P}_{(3.13)} \le \frac{3\varepsilon}{4}\,\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n} + K\sum_{j=0}^{k}\mathbf{P}\big(|S_j| > \lambda\big)\,\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n} \le \varepsilon \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n}$, if we choose some $\lambda = \lambda(k, \varepsilon)$ large enough. This proves (3.13) and completes the proof of Lemma 3.5. □

We present a renewal result associated to the random walk $(S_n)_{n\ge 0}$.

Lemma 3.6. *Under (1.4). Let $G : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a measurable function such that for some $b > 1$ and some positive constant $K > 0$,*

$$\sup_{z\in\mathbb{R}} |G(x,z)| \le K\,(1+x)^{-b}, \qquad \forall\, x \ge 0. \tag{3.21}$$

Assume furthermore that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $\lim_{z\to-\infty} G(x,z)$ exists, and denote it by $G_*(x)$. Then

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{e}^{\alpha_n}\mathbf{E}\left[1_{\{\tau_\zeta=n,\, S_n\ge y\}} G(S_n-y, X_n)\right] = \mathtt{m}^{-(\alpha+1)} \int_0^\infty G_*(x)\,\mathrm{d}x, \tag{3.22}$$

uniformly on $|y| \le \frac{n}{\log n}$ and $\frac{\zeta_n}{4} \le \zeta \le 4\zeta_n$.

Proof of Lemma (3.6). Without loss of generality we may assume that G takes nonnegative values. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be small. Let $E_n^{(n)} := \{|S_{n-1} - \mathtt{m}\,(n-1)| \le \frac{n}{\log n}\}$ as in (3.8). By (3.9),

$$\mathbf{P}\big(\tau_\zeta = n, (E_n^{(n)})^c\big) \le n^{-(\alpha+\gamma-1)}\ell_2(n) \le \varepsilon\,\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n},$$

for all large n. Let us denote by $\mathbf{E}_{(3.22)}$ the expectation term in (3.22). Then

$$\mathrm{e}^{\alpha_n}\mathbf{E}_{(3.22)} = \mathrm{e}^{\alpha_n}\mathbf{E}\left[1_{\{\tau_\zeta=n, S_n\ge y\}\cap E_n^{(n)}}\, G(S_n-y, X_n)\right] + O(\varepsilon). \tag{3.23}$$

To deal with the above expectation term, we distinguish two situations according to the value of $S_n - y$: Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{e}^{\alpha_n}\mathbf{E}\left[1_{\{\tau_\zeta=n, S_n-y\ge \frac{n}{\log n}\}\cap E_n^{(n)}}\, G(S_n-y, X_n)\right] &\le \mathrm{e}^{\alpha_n} K\,(1+\frac{n}{\log n})^{-b}\mathbf{P}(X_n < -\zeta) \\
&= K\,(1+\frac{n}{\log n})^{-b}\mathrm{e}^{\alpha_n}\int_{-\infty}^{-\zeta} |x|^{-\alpha-1}\ell(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\le \varepsilon,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

uniformly on $\zeta \in [\frac{\zeta_n}{4}, 4\zeta_n]$ since $b > 1$. If $0 \le S_n - y < \frac{n}{\log n}$, then on the event $E_n^{(n)}$, $X_n = S_n - S_{n-1}$ satisfies that $|X_n + \mathtt{m}\,(n-1)| \le 3\frac{n}{\log n}$ uniformly on $|y| \le \frac{n}{\log n}$, hence $\mathrm{e}^{\alpha_n}|X_n|^{-\alpha-1}\ell(X_n) = \mathtt{m}^{-(\alpha+1)} + o(1)$. Moreover, since for n large enough on $E_n^{(n)}$ we have $X_n \le -\zeta$ so that $\tau_\zeta \le n$, and it is easily seen that conditionally on $\tau_\zeta \le n$, the probability that $\tau_\zeta^{(2)} > n$ tends to 1 as n tends to ∞, we can write $1_{\{\tau_\zeta=n, 0\le S_n-y<\frac{n}{\log n}\}\cap E_n^{(n)}} = 1_{E_n^{(n)}}(1-\gamma_n)$, with $\lim_{n\to\infty}\gamma_n = 0$ uniformly on $|y| \le \frac{n}{\log n}$.

Therefore for all large n,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{e}^{\alpha_n}\mathbf{E}\left[1_{\{\tau_\zeta=n, 0\le S_n-y<\frac{n}{\log n}\}\cap E_n^{(n)}}\, G(S_n-y, X_n)\right] \\
= \;& \mathbf{E}\Big[1_{E_n^{(n)}} \int_{\substack{\{0\le S_{n-1}+z-y<\frac{n}{\log n}\} \\ \{|z+\mathtt{m}\,(n-1)|\le 3\frac{n}{\log n}\}}} G(S_{n-1}+z-y, z)(\mathrm{e}^{\alpha_n}|z|^{-\alpha-1}\ell(z))\,\mathrm{d}z\Big] + R_n,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

with

$$R_n = -\mathrm{e}^{\alpha_n}\mathbf{E}\left[\gamma_n \mathrm{e}^{\alpha_n}\cdot 1_{\{\tau_\zeta=n, 0\le S_n-y<\frac{n}{\log n}\}\cap E_n^{(n)}}\, G(S_n-y, X_n)\right].$$

This yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{e}^{\alpha_n}\mathbf{E}\left[1_{\{\tau_\zeta=n,0\le S_n-y<\frac{n}{\log n}\}\cap E_n^{(n)}}\,G(S_n-y,X_n)\right]\\
=\;&(\mathtt{m}^{-(\alpha+1)}+o(1))\,\mathbf{E}\Big[1_{\{\tau_\zeta=n\}\cap E_n^{(n)}}\int 1_{\{0\le S_{n-1}+z-y<\frac{n}{\log n}\}}\,G(S_{n-1}+z-y,z)\,\mathrm{d}z\Big]+R_n\\
=\;&(\mathtt{m}^{-(\alpha+1)}+o(1))\,\mathbf{E}\Big[1_{E_n^{(n)}}\int_0^{\frac{n}{\log(n)}}G(x,x+y-S_{n-1})\,\mathrm{d}x\Big]+R_n\\
=:\;&(\mathtt{m}^{-(\alpha+1)}+o(1))\,\mathbf{E}_{(3.26)}+R_n. \qquad (3.26)
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that for any fixed $x\in\mathbb{R}_+$ and $|y|\le\frac{n}{\log n}$, $1_{E_n^{(n)}}G(x,x+y-S_{n-1})$ converges a.s. to $G_*(x)$ as $n\to\infty$. Indeed S_{n-1} tends linearly to $-\infty$ and $1_{E_n^{(n)}}$ converges to 1 a.s. by the Kolmogorov-Marcinkiewicz-Zygmund law of large numbers.

It then follows from (3.21), the dominated convergence theorem, and the fact that $y-S_{n-1}$ tends a.s. uniformly to 0 on $|y|\le\frac{n}{\log n}$ that $\mathbf{E}_{(3.26)}\to\int_0^\infty G_*(x)\mathrm{d}x$, uniformly on $|y|\le\frac{n}{\log n}$. Then, bounding the function integrated in R_n by $\mathrm{e}^{\alpha_n}1_{E_n^{(n)}}G(S_n-y,X_n)$ and using bounded convergence theorem we get $R_n\to0$, still uniformly on $|y|\le\frac{n}{\log n}$. In view of (3.23), (3.24) and (3.26), this yields the desired conclusion. □

4 Proof of Proposition 1.1

At first let us fix some notations which will be used throughout the rest of this paper: For $|u|=n$, we write $[\varnothing,u]\equiv\{u_0:=\varnothing,u_1,...,u_{n-1},u_n=u\}$ the shortest path from the root $\varnothing$ to u such that $|u_i|=i$ for any $0\le i\le n$. For any $u,v\in\mathbb{T}$, we use the partial order $u<v$ if u is an ancestor of v and $u\le v$ if $u<v$ or $u=v$. By the standard words-representation in a tree, $u<v$ if and only if the word v is a concatenation of the word u with some word s, namely $v=us$ with $|s|\ge1$. Denote by $\mathbb{T}^{(u)}:=\{v:u\le v\}$ the subtree rooted at u and by $\mathbb{T}_n:=\{v:|v|=n\}$ the set of vertices at generation n for any integer n. Let $\overleftarrow{v}$ be the parent of v for any $v\ne\varnothing$.

The following so-called many-to-one formula (4.1) can be obtained as a consequence of the spinal decomposition (see Proposition 1.4): Under (1.1), for any $n\ge1$ and any measurable function $g:\mathbb{R}^n\to[0,+\infty)$,

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{|u|=n}g(V(u_1),...,V(u_n))\Big]=\mathbf{E}\Big[\mathrm{e}^{S_n}g(S_1,...,S_n)\Big]. \qquad (4.1)$$

The proof of Proposition 1.1 will be based on the forthcoming three lemmas. The first one is a well-known fact in the studies of branching random walk:

Lemma 4.1. *Assume (1.1). We have that*

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\exists u\in\mathbb{T},\,V(u)\le-x\Big)\le\mathrm{e}^{-x},\qquad\forall\,x>0. \qquad (4.2)$$

Lemma 4.1 follows from a simple application of (4.1) if one considers the first generation k such that for some $u\in\mathbb{T}_k$, $V(u)\le-x$, see e.g. Shi [45] for details.

To state the second lemma, we need to introduce some notations similar to that in (3.3) and (3.4): Recall that $\zeta_n := \frac{n}{(\log n)^3}$. For any $u \in \mathbb{T}$, let $\tau_{\zeta_n}^{(u)}$ and $\tau_{\zeta_n}^{(2,u)}$ be the first and the second large drop in the path $\{V(u_i), 1 \le i \le |u|\}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(u)} &:= \inf\{i \in [1, |u|] : V(u_i) - V(u_{i-1}) < -\zeta_n\}, && (4.3)\\ \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(2,u)} &:= \inf\{i \in (\tau_{\zeta_n}^{(u)}, |u|] : V(u_i) - V(u_{i-1}) < -\zeta_n\}, && (4.4) \end{aligned}$$

with $\inf \emptyset := \infty$. Recall that $\alpha_n = (\alpha+1)\log n - \log \ell(n)$. Our second lemma says that for those u such that $V(u) \le \alpha_n - x$, necessarily there is an unique large drop before $|u|$:

Lemma 4.2. *Assume (1.1) and (1.4). For any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $n_0(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that for any $n \ge n_0(\varepsilon)$ and all $x \ge 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\big(\exists u \in \mathbb{T}_n,\, V(u) \le \alpha_n - x,\, \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(u)} > n\big) &\le \varepsilon\, \mathrm{e}^{-x}, && (4.5)\\ \mathbb{P}\big(\exists u \in \mathbb{T}_n,\, V(u) \le \alpha_n - x,\, \min_{\tau_{\zeta_n}^{(u)} \le j \le n} V(u_j) \ge -x - \alpha_n,\, \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(2,u)} \le n\big) &\le \varepsilon\, \mathrm{e}^{-x}. && (4.6) \end{aligned}$$

Consequently for any $x > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\exists u \in \mathbb{T}_n,\, V(u) \le \alpha_n - x,\, \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(2,u)} \le n\big) \le \varepsilon\, \mathrm{e}^{-x} \qquad (4.7)$$

We may replace in (4.6) $\min_{\tau_{\zeta_n}^{(u)} \le j \le n} V(u_j) \ge -x - \alpha_n$ by $\min_{\tau_{\zeta_n}^{(u)} \le j \le n} V(u_j) \ge -x - n^b$ with any constant $b \in (0, \alpha + \frac{1}{\alpha} - 2)$.

Proof of Lemma 4.2. By the many-to-one formula (4.1) and using the notations (3.3) and (3.4), the probability term in (4.5) is less than

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{|u|=n} 1_{\{V(u) \le \alpha_n - x, \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(u)} > n\}}\Big) &= \mathbf{E}\left(\mathrm{e}^{S_n} 1_{\{S_n \le \alpha_n - x, \tau_{\zeta_n} > n\}}\right)\\ &\le \mathrm{e}^{-x+\alpha_n} \mathbf{P}\left(S_n \le \alpha_n - x, \tau_{\zeta_n} > n\right)\\ &\le \mathrm{e}^{-x+\alpha_n} \mathbf{P}\Big(S_n - \mathtt{m}\, n \le \alpha_n - \mathtt{m}\, n, \min_{1 \le i \le n} X_i \ge -\zeta_n\Big)\\ &\le \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\mathtt{m}}{2}(\log n)^3} \mathrm{e}^{-x}, \end{aligned}$$

for all large $n \ge n_1$ and where we have used Lemma 3.1 for the last inequality. This proves (4.5).

Let us denote by $\mathbb{P}_{(4.6)}$ the probability term in (4.6). Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{(4.6)} &\le \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{|u|=n} 1_{\{V(u) \le \alpha_n - x,\, \min_{\tau_{\zeta_n}^{(u)} \le j \le n} V(u_j) \ge -x-\alpha_n, \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(2,u)} \le n\}}\right]\\ &= \mathbf{E}\left[\mathrm{e}^{S_n} 1_{\{S_n \le \alpha_n - x,\, \min_{\tau_{\zeta_n} \le j \le n} S_j \ge -x-\alpha_n,\, \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(2)} \le n\}}\right]\\ &\le \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil 2\alpha_n \rceil + 1} \mathrm{e}^{k-x-\alpha_n} \mathbf{P}\left(S_n + \alpha_n + x \in [k-1, k),\, \min_{\tau_{\zeta_n} \le j \le n} S_j \ge -x - \alpha_n,\, \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(2)} \le n\right). \end{aligned}$$

By applying (3.11) with $y \equiv -x-\alpha_n$, we get that [R is a nondecreasing function] for any $1 \le k \le \lceil 2\alpha_n \rceil + 1$,

$$\mathbf{P}\left(S_n + \alpha_n + x \in [k-1,k),\ \min_{\tau^{(2)}_{\zeta_n} \le j \le n} S_j \ge -x-\alpha_n,\ \tau^{(2)}_{\zeta_n} \le n \right) \le n^{1-1/\alpha-2\alpha} \ell_3(n)\, R(2\alpha_n+2),$$

which implies that

$$\mathbb{P}_{(4.6)} \le \mathrm{e}^{-x-\alpha_n}\, \mathrm{e}^{2\alpha_n+1}\, n^{1-1/\alpha-2\alpha} \ell_3(n)\, R(2\alpha_n+2) = \mathrm{e}^{-x}\, n^{2-\alpha-1/\alpha}\, \ell_4(n)$$

with some slowly varying function ℓ_4. Since for $\alpha > 1$, $2-\alpha-1/\alpha < 0$, (4.6) follows.

Finally, we deduce from (4.6) and Lemma 4.1 that the probability term in (4.7) is less than $\varepsilon \mathrm{e}^{-x} + \mathbf{P}\big(\exists u \in \mathbb{T} : V(u) < -x-\alpha_n\big) \le \varepsilon \mathrm{e}^{-x} + \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n - x} \le 2\varepsilon \mathrm{e}^{-x}$ yielding (4.6). □

Below is the third and the last lemma that we need in the proof of Proposition 1.1:

Lemma 4.3. *Assume (1.1) and (1.4). There exist $K, c_4 > 0$ such that for any n and $L_0 \in \mathbb{N}^*$ large enough, and for any $x \ge 0$ and $L \in [L_0, (2+\alpha)\log n]$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\exists u \in \mathbb{T}_n,\, V(u) \le \alpha_n - x,\ \min_{\tau^{(u)}_{\zeta_n} \le j \le n} V(u_j) - (\alpha_n - x) \in [-L, -L+1],\ \tau^{(u)}_{\zeta_n} \le n < \tau^{(2,u)}_{\zeta_n}\big) \le K\, \mathrm{e}^{-c_4 L} \mathrm{e}^{-x}. \tag{4.8}$$

Consequently there exists some constant $c_2 > 0$ such that for any $L \ge L_0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\exists u \in \mathbb{T}_n,\, V(u) \le \alpha_n - x,\ \min_{\tau^{(u)}_{\zeta_n} \le j \le n} V(u_j) \le \alpha_n - x - L,\ \tau^{(u)}_{\zeta_n} \le n < \tau^{(2,u)}_{\zeta_n}\big) \le K\, \mathrm{e}^{-c_2 L} \mathrm{e}^{-x}. \tag{4.9}$$

Proof of Lemma 4.3. Let $\mathbb{P}_{(4.8)}$ the probability term in (4.8). Pick up a constant $\beta \in (0, \frac{1}{4(2+\alpha)})$. Notice that $L < (2+\alpha)\log n$ implies $\mathrm{e}^{\beta L} \le n^{\frac{1}{4}}$. For notational simplification, we write in this proof

$$y \equiv y(n,x,L) := \alpha_n - x - L$$

(notice that $y < \mathtt{m}\, n/2$ if n is large enough).

For any $u \in \mathbb{T}_n$ satisfying the condition in the probability term in (4.8), there exists $p \in [\tau^{(u)}_{\zeta_n}, n]$ such that $V(u_p) \in [y, y+1]$. Then $\tau^{(u)}_{\zeta_n} = \tau^{(u_p)}_{\zeta_n}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{(4.8)} &\le \sum_{p=1}^{n} \mathbb{P}\Big(\exists u \in \mathbb{T}_n,\ \min_{\tau^{(u)}_{\zeta_n} \le j \le n} V(u_j) \ge y,\, V(u_p) - y \in [0,1], V(u) \le y+L,\, \tau^{(u)}_{\zeta_n} \le p,\, \tau^{(2,u)}_{\zeta_n} > n\Big) \\ &\le \sum_{p=1}^{n-\lfloor \mathrm{e}^{\beta L} \rfloor} A_{(4.10)}(p) + \sum_{p=n-\lfloor \mathrm{e}^{\beta L} \rfloor}^{n} B_{(4.10)}(p), \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} A_{(4.10)}(p) &:= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{|u|=n} 1_{\{\min_{\tau^{(u)}_{\zeta_n} \le j \le n} V(u_j) \ge y,\, V(u_p) - y \in [0,1],\, V(u) \le y+L,\, \tau^{(u)}_{\zeta_n} \le p,\, \tau^{(2,u)}_{\zeta_n} > n\}} \right], \\ B_{(4.10)}(p) &:= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{|v|=p} 1_{\{\min_{\tau^{(v)}_{\zeta_n} \le j \le p} V(v_j) \ge y,\, V(v) - y \in [0,1],\, \tau^{(v)}_{\zeta_n} \le p < \tau^{(2,v)}_{\zeta_n}\}} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the sum of the expectation term of $B_{(4.10)}(p)$ is obtained by considering $v = u_p$ satisfying $V(u_p) \in [y, y+1]$. We omitted the dependence on n in both $A_{(4.10)}(p)$ and $B_{(4.10)}(p)$. By using (4.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} B_{(4.10)}(p) &= \mathbf{E}\Big[\mathrm{e}^{S_p} 1_{\{\min_{\tau_{\zeta_n} \le j \le p} S_j \ge y,\, S_p - y \in [0,1],\, \tau_{\zeta_n} \le p < \tau^{(2)}_{\zeta_n}\}}\Big] \\ &\le \mathrm{e}^{y+1}\, \mathbf{P}\Big(\min_{\tau_{\zeta_n} \le j \le p} S_j \ge y,\, S_p - y \in [0,1],\, \tau_{\zeta_n} \le p < \tau^{(2)}_{\zeta_n}\Big) \\ &\le K'\, \mathrm{e}^{y}\, \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_p}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

where the last inequality follows from (3.12) by remarking that $\frac{\zeta_p}{4} \le \zeta_n \le 4\zeta_p$ for any $p \in [n - \lfloor \mathrm{e}^{\beta L} \rfloor, n]$; moreover $\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_p} \sim \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n}$, so for all large n,

$$\sum_{p=n-\lfloor \mathrm{e}^{\beta L} \rfloor}^{n} B_{(4.10)}(p) \le 2\, K' \mathrm{e}^{y+\beta L}\, \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n} \le K\, \mathrm{e}^{-x-L/2}.$$

It remains to estimate $A_{(4.10)}(p)$. By applying (4.1),

$$\begin{aligned} A_{(4.10)}(p) &= \mathbf{E}\Big[\mathrm{e}^{S_n} 1_{\{\min_{\tau_{\zeta_n} \le j \le n} S_j \ge y,\, S_p - y \in [0,1],\, S_n \le y+L,\, \tau_{\zeta_n} \le p,\, \tau^{(2)}_{\zeta_n} > n\}}\Big] \\ &\le \mathrm{e}^{y+L} \mathbf{P}\Big(\min_{\tau_{\zeta_n} \le j \le n} S_j \ge y,\, S_p - y \in [0,1],\, S_n - y \in [0, L],\, \tau_{\zeta_n} \le p,\, \tau^{(2)}_{\zeta_n} > n\Big). \end{aligned}$$

By applying the Markov property at time p, we see that the above probability term is equal to

$$\mathbf{E}\Big[1_{\{\min_{\tau_{\zeta_n} \le j \le p} S_j \ge y,\, S_p - y \in [0,1], \tau_{\zeta_n} \le p < \tau^{(2)}_{\zeta_n}\}} \mathbf{P}_{S_p}\big(\underline{S}_{n-p} \ge y, S_{n-p} - y \in [0, L], \tau_{\zeta_n} > n - p\big)\Big].$$

For any $z \equiv S_p \in [y, y+1]$, $\mathbf{P}_z\big(\underline{S}_{n-p} \ge y, S_{n-p} - y \in [0, L], \tau_{\zeta_n} > n - p\big) \le \mathbf{P}\big(\underline{S}_{n-p} \ge -1, S_{n-p} \in [-1, L+1], \tau_{\zeta_n} > n - p\big)$. Recalling that $y = \alpha_n - x - L$, we get

$$A_{(4.10)}(p) \le \mathrm{e}^{\alpha_n - x}\, I_{(4.12)}\, J_{(4.12)}, \tag{4.12}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} I_{(4.12)} &:= \mathbf{P}\Big(\min_{\tau_{\zeta_n} \le j \le p} S_j \ge y,\, S_p - y \in [0,1], \tau_{\zeta_n} \le p < \tau^{(2)}_{\zeta_n}\Big), \\ J_{(4.12)} &:= \mathbf{P}\big(\underline{S}_{n-p} \ge -1, S_{n-p} \in [-1, L+1], \tau_{\zeta_n} > n - p\big). \end{aligned}$$

For $1 \le p < \lfloor \frac{n}{4} \rfloor$, we apply Lemma 3.1 to see that $J_{(4.12)} \le \mathbf{P}\big(S_{n-p} \le L+1, \tau_{\zeta_n} > n - p\big) \le K \mathrm{e}^{-(\frac{3\mathfrak{m}\, n}{4} - (L+1))/\zeta_n}$, hence for $1 \le p < \lfloor \frac{n}{4} \rfloor$,

$$A_{(4.10)}(p) \le K\, \mathrm{e}^{\alpha_n - x}\, \mathrm{e}^{-(\frac{3\mathfrak{m}\, n}{4} - (L+1))/\zeta_n} \le \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\mathfrak{m}}{2}(\log n)^3} \mathrm{e}^{-x}. \tag{4.13}$$

For $\lfloor \frac{n}{4} \rfloor \le p \le n - \lfloor \mathrm{e}^{\beta L} \rfloor$, we apply (3.12) for $I_{(4.12)}$ (with $y \equiv \alpha_n - L - x \le \alpha_n \le \frac{\mathfrak{m}}{2} p$ and $\zeta = \zeta_n \in [\frac{\zeta_p}{4}, 4\zeta_p]$), and $L+1$ times Lemma 3.4 for $J_{(4.12)}$ (recall that $n - p \ge \lfloor \mathrm{e}^{\beta L} \rfloor \ge \mathrm{e}^{\beta L_0}$ large and thus $L \le \frac{\mathfrak{m}}{2}(n-p)$) we get

$$A_{(4.10)}(p) \le K'\, \mathrm{e}^{\alpha_n - x}\, \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n}\, (L+1) \frac{\ell(n-p)}{(n-p)^{\alpha}} \le K''\, \mathrm{e}^{-x} (L+1) \frac{\ell(n-p)}{(n-p)^{\alpha}},$$

which together with (4.13) yield that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{p=1}^{n-\lfloor \mathrm{e}^{\beta L}\rfloor} A_{(4.10)}(p) &\leq \mathrm{e}^{-x}\, n\, \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\mathfrak{m}}{2}(\log n)^3} + K'' \mathrm{e}^{-x}(L+1) \sum_{p=\lfloor \frac{n}{4}\rfloor}^{n-\lfloor \mathrm{e}^{\beta L}\rfloor} \frac{\ell(n-p)}{(n-p)^{\alpha}} \\ &\leq K\, \mathrm{e}^{-x} \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{(\alpha-1)}{2}\beta L},\end{aligned}$$

proving (4.8).

It remains to prove (4.9). Let $c_3 := \frac{1}{2(\alpha+2)}$. Remark that if $L \geq \frac{\alpha_n}{1-c_3}$, then $\alpha_n - L \leq -c_3 L$ and it follows from Lemma 4.1 that

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\exists u \in \mathbb{T}_n, \min_{\tau_{\zeta_n}^{(u)} \leq j \leq n} V(u_j) \leq \alpha_n - x - L,\, \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(u)} \leq n\big) \leq \mathrm{e}^{-c_3 L - x}.$$

Therefore it is enough to treat the case $L_0 \leq L < \frac{\alpha_n}{1-c_3}$. As $n \geq n_0$, $\frac{\alpha_n}{1-c_3} \leq (2+\alpha)\log n$. Then the probability term in (4.9) is less than

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}\big(\exists u \in \mathbb{T}_n,\, V(u) \leq \alpha_n - x,\, \min_{\tau_{\zeta_n}^{(u)} \leq j \leq n} V(u_j) - (\alpha_n - x) \leq -c_3 L,\, \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(u)} \leq n < \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(2,u)}\big) \\ &+ \sum_{k=L}^{\alpha_n + c_3 L} \mathbb{P}\big(\exists u \in \mathbb{T}_n,\, V(u) \leq \alpha_n - x,\, \min_{\tau_{\zeta_n}^{(u)} \leq j \leq n} V(u_j) - (\alpha_n - x) \in [-k, -k+1),\, \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(u)} \leq n < \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(2,u)}\big) \\ &\leq \mathrm{e}^{-c_3 L - x} + \sum_{k=L}^{\alpha_n/(1-c_3)} \mathrm{e}^{-c_4 k - x} \\ &\leq \mathrm{e}^{-c_3 L - x} + K' \mathrm{e}^{-c_4 L - x}.\end{aligned}$$

We get (4.9) by choosing $c_2 := \min(c_3, c_4)$. □

Now we can tackle the *Proof of Proposition 1.1.* We fix an arbitrary integer $L \in [L_0, (2+\alpha)\log n]$ (as in Lemma 4.3) and consider large n. Then

$$\mathbb{P}\left(M_n \leq \alpha_n - x\right) \leq \mathbb{P}^{(1)}_{(4.14)} + \mathbb{P}^{(2)}_{(4.14)} + \mathbb{P}^{(3)}_{(4.14)} + \mathbb{P}^{(4)}_{(4.14)}, \tag{4.14}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}^{(1)}_{(4.14)} &:= \mathbb{P}\left(\exists u \in \mathbb{T},\, V(u) \leq -x\right) \\ \mathbb{P}^{(2)}_{(4.14)} &:= \mathbb{P}\big(\exists u \in \mathbb{T}_n,\, V(u) \leq \alpha_n - x,\, \min_{\tau_{\zeta_n}^{(u)} \leq j \leq n} V(u_j) > -x,\, \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(2,u)} \leq n\big) \\ &\qquad + \mathbb{P}\big(\exists u \in \mathbb{T}_n,\, V(u) \leq \alpha_n - x,\, \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(u)} > n\big) \\ \mathbb{P}^{(3)}_{(4.14)} &:= \sum_{k=L}^{\alpha_n+1} \mathbb{P}\big(\exists u \in \mathbb{T}_n,\, V(u) \leq \alpha_n - x,\, \min_{\tau_{\zeta_n}^{(u)} \leq j \leq n} V(u_j) - (\alpha_n - x) \in [-k, -k+1),\, \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(u)} \leq n < \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(2,u)}\big) \\ \mathbb{P}^{(4)}_{(4.14)} &:= \mathbb{P}\big(\exists u \in \mathbb{T}_n,\, V(u) \leq \alpha_n - x,\, \min_{\tau_{\zeta_n}^{(u)} \leq j \leq n} V(u_j) \geq \alpha_n - x - L,\, \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(u)} \leq n < \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(2,u)}\big)\end{aligned}$$

Based on (4.2), (4.5), (4.7) and (4.8), we only need to estimate $\mathbb{P}^{(4)}_{(4.14)}$. By the many-to-one formula (4.1), we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}^{(4)}_{(4.14)} &\le \mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{|u|=n} 1_{\{V(u)\le \alpha_n - x,\, \min_{\tau^{(u)}_{\zeta_n}\le j\le n} V(u_j)\ge \alpha_n - x - L,\, \tau^{(u)}_{\zeta_n}\le n < \tau^{(2,u)}_{\zeta_n}\}}\Big] \\
&\le \mathbf{E}\Big[\mathrm{e}^{S_n} 1_{\{S_n\le \alpha_n - x,\, \min_{\tau_{\zeta_n}\le j\le n} S_j \ge \alpha_n - x - L,\, \tau_{\zeta_n}\le n < \tau^{(2)}_{\zeta_n}\}}\Big] \\
&\le \mathrm{e}^{\alpha_n - x}\mathbf{P}\left(S_n \le \alpha_n - x,\, \min_{\tau_{\zeta_n}\le j\le n} S_j \ge \alpha_n - x - L,\, \tau_{\zeta_n}\le n < \tau^{(2)}_{\zeta_n}\right) \\
&\le \mathrm{e}^{\alpha_n - x}\sum_{k=1}^{L}\mathbf{P}\left(S_n - \alpha_n + x \in [-k, -k+1],\, \min_{\tau_{\zeta_n}\le j\le n} S_j \ge \alpha_n - x - L,\, \tau_{\zeta_n}\le n < \tau^{(2)}_{\zeta_n}\right) \\
&\le K\mathrm{e}^{-x}L^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where to obtain the last estimate, we have used several times the display (3.15) (with $y = -\alpha_n + x + L$, $a = L - k$, $i \in [1, n]$ there). This completes the proof of Proposition 1.1. □

We end this section by a Lemma which will be used in Section 5:

Lemma 4.4. *Assume (1.1) and (1.4). Let $\varepsilon > 0$. For any $L > 0$, there are some integers $T = T(\varepsilon, L)$ and $n_0 = n_0(\varepsilon, L) > T$ such that for all $n \ge n_0$ and all $x > 0$:*

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\exists u \in \mathbb{T}_n,\, V(u) \le \alpha_n - x,\, \min_{\tau^{(u)}_{\zeta_n}\le j\le n} V(u_j) \ge \alpha_n - x - L,\, \tau^{(u)}_{\zeta_n} \le n - T,\, \tau^{(2,u)}_{\zeta_n} > n\Big) \le \varepsilon\,\mathrm{e}^{-x}. \quad (4.15)$$

Proof of Lemma 4.4 : Denote by $\mathbb{P}_{(4.15)}$ the probability term in (4.15) and write $y = \alpha_n - x - L$. Then by the many-to-one formula

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_{(4.15)} &\le \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{|u|=n} 1_{\{V(u)\le y+L,\, \min_{\tau^{(u)}_{\zeta_n}\le j\le n} V(u_j)\ge y,\, \tau^{(u)}_{\zeta_n}\le n-T,\, \tau^{(2,u)}_{\zeta_n} > n\}}\right] \\
&= \mathbf{E}\left[\mathrm{e}^{S_n} 1_{\{S_n\le y+L,\, \min_{\tau_{\zeta_n}\le j\le n} S_j\ge y,\, \tau_{\zeta_n}\le n-T,\, \tau^{(2)}_{\zeta_n} > n\}}\right] \\
&\le \sum_{i=1}^{n-T}\sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor L\rfloor+1} \mathrm{e}^{y+k}\mathbf{P}\Big(S_n - y \in [k-1, k),\, \min_{\tau_{\zeta_n}\le j\le n} S_j \ge y,\, \tau_{\zeta_n} = i,\, \tau^{(2)}_{\zeta_n} > n\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Each probability term in the above double sum is less than, by (3.15), $K\mathbf{P}(\overline{S}_{n-i+1} \le k)\,\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n} + n^{-(\alpha+\gamma-1)}\ell_3(n) \le K\mathbf{P}(\overline{S}_{n-i+1} \le L+1)\,\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n} + n^{-(\alpha+\gamma-1)}\ell_3(n)$, hence by taking the double sum over i and k,

$$\mathbb{P}_{(4.15)} \le K'\mathrm{e}^{-x}\sum_{j=T}^{n}\mathbf{P}(\overline{S}_j \le L+1) + \mathrm{e}^{-x}\,\mathrm{e}^{\alpha_n}\,n^{-(\alpha+\gamma-2)}\ell_3(n).$$

Taking $T = T(\varepsilon, L)$ large enough such that $\sum_{j=T}^{\infty}\mathbf{P}(\overline{S}_j \le L+1) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2K'}$ and n_0 large enough so that $\mathrm{e}^{\alpha_n}\,n^{-(\alpha+\gamma-2)}\ell_3(n) \le \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ for all $n \ge n_0$, we get (4.15). □

5 Proof of Proposition 2.1

At first we analyze the trajectory of a particle which reaches the minimum at time n.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be small and $x > 0$. Let $L \equiv L(\varepsilon) \geq L_0$ with L_0 is given by Lemma 4.3 be such that $K\mathrm{e}^{-c_2 L} < \varepsilon$. Consider the event that there is some $u \in \mathbb{T}_n$ such that $V(u) \leq \alpha_n - x$. By (4.5) and (4.7), with a cost at most $2\varepsilon \mathrm{e}^{-x}$, we may assume that $\tau_{\zeta_n}^{(u)} \leq n$, which in view of (4.9) yields that we may furthermore assume $\min_{\tau_{\zeta_n}^{(u)} \leq j \leq n} V(u_j) > \alpha_n - x - L$ with an extra cost at most equal to $\varepsilon \mathrm{e}^{-x}$. Finally by (4.15), there exists some integer $T \equiv T(L, \varepsilon)$ such that we may assume $\tau_{\zeta_n}^{(u)} > n - T$ with an extra cost at most equal to $\varepsilon \mathrm{e}^{-x}$. Consequently for all large $n \geq n_1(\varepsilon)$ and for all $x > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\big(M_n \leq \alpha_n - x\big) \\ = \; & \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\sum_{|u|=n} 1_{\{M_n = V(u) \leq \alpha_n - x,\, \min_{\tau_{\zeta_n}^{(u)} \leq j \leq n} V(u_j) \geq \alpha_n - x - L,\, \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(u)} \in [n-T, n]\}}}{\sum_{|u|=n} 1_{\{V(u) = M_n\}}}\right] + O(\varepsilon)\, \mathrm{e}^{-x} \\ = \; & \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\mathrm{e}^{V(w_n)} \frac{1_{\{M_n = V(w_n) \leq \alpha_n - x,\, \min_{\tau_{\zeta_n}^{(w_n)} \leq j \leq n} V(w_j) \geq \alpha_n - x - L,\, \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(w_n)} \in [n-T, n]\}}}{\sum_{|u|=n} 1_{\{V(u) = M_n\}}}\right] + O(\varepsilon)\, \mathrm{e}^{-x}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

where we have used the change of measure (cf. Proposition 1.4) for the last equality and $O(\varepsilon)$ denotes, as usual, some term bounded by a numerical constant times ε (here by 5ε).

The next goal is to analyze the number of minima $\eta_n := \sum_{|u|=n} 1_{\{V(u) = M_n\}}$ in (5.1). To this end, we consider the following event

$$\mathcal{E}_n(x) := \Big\{\forall k < \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(w_n)},\, \forall v \in \mathbb{B}(w_k),\, \min_{u \geq v,\, |u|=n} V(u) > \alpha_n - x\Big\}, \tag{5.2}$$

where $\mathbb{B}(w_k)$, defined in (1.6), denotes the set of brothers of w_k. The following result will be proved in Section 6.

Proposition 5.1. *Under (1.1), (1.4) and (1.7), for any ε, L, $T > 0$ there exists $x_1 > 0$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough and $x \geq x_1$,*

$$\mathbb{Q}\left(V(w_n) \leq \alpha_n - x,\, \min_{\tau_{\zeta_n}^{(w_n)} \leq j \leq n} V(w_j) \geq \alpha_n - x - L,\, \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(w_n)} \in [n-T, n],\, (\mathcal{E}_n(x))^c\right) \leq \varepsilon\, \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n}. \tag{5.3}$$

Consequently for all $x \geq x_1$ and all large n,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\mathrm{e}^{V(w_n)} 1_{\{V(w_n) \leq \alpha_n - x,\, \min_{\tau_{\zeta_n}^{(w_n)} \leq j \leq n} V(w_j) \geq \alpha_n - x - L,\, \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(w_n)} \in [n-T, n],\, (\mathcal{E}_n(x))^c\}}\right] \leq \varepsilon\, \mathrm{e}^{-x}. \tag{5.4}$$

For any $u \in \mathbb{T}$ and $j \geq 0$, we define

$$M_j(u) := \min_{|v| = |u| + j,\, v \in \mathbb{T}^{(u)}} (V(v) - V(u)), \qquad \eta_j(u) := \sum_{|v| = |u| + j,\, v \in \mathbb{T}^{(u)}} 1_{\{V(v) - V(u) = M_j(u)\}}, \tag{5.5}$$

with $M_j(\varnothing) \equiv M_j$ and $\eta_j(\varnothing) \equiv \eta_j$. In the case that the subtree $\mathbb{T}^{(u)}$ does not survive up to j-th generation, by definition $M_j(u) = \infty$ and $\eta_j(u) = 0$ [which is in agreement with the convention that $\sum_{\emptyset} \equiv 0$].

On the event $\mathcal{E}_n(x) \cap \{M_n \le \alpha_n - x\}$, any particle located at the minimum stays on the spine at least up to the generation $\tau_{\zeta_n}^{(w_n)} - 1$. Therefore on $\mathcal{E}_n(x) \cap \{\tau_{\zeta_n}^{(w_n)} = k\}$, for any $|u| = n$ satisfying that $V(u) = M_n$, there is some v with $\overleftarrow{v} = w_{k-1}$ such that $u \in \mathbb{T}^{(v)}$ (either $v = w_k$ or $v \in \mathbb{B}(w_k)$). We obtain that on $\mathcal{E}_n(x) \cap \{\tau_{\zeta_n}^{(w_n)} = k\}$ with $k \le n$,

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_n \equiv \sum_{|u|=n} 1_{\{V(u)=M_n\}} &= \sum_{\overleftarrow{v}=w_{k-1}} \sum_{|u|=n, u\in\mathbb{T}^{(v)}} 1_{\{V(u)=M_n\}} \\ &= \sum_{\overleftarrow{v}=w_{k-1}} \eta_{n-k}(v)\, 1_{\{M_{n-k}(v)=M_n-V(v)\}}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

In view of (5.1) and (5.4), we deduce from (5.6) that for any $x \ge x_1$, for n large enough,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}(M_n \le \alpha_n - x) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big[\frac{\mathrm{e}^{V(w_n)}}{\eta_n} 1_{\{M_n=V(w_n)\le \alpha_n - x,\, \min_{\tau_{\zeta_n}^{(w_n)}\le j\le n} V(w_j) \ge \alpha_n - x - L,\, \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(w_n)} \in [n-T, n]\}},\, \mathcal{E}_n(x)\Big] + O(\varepsilon)\mathrm{e}^{-x} \\ &= \sum_{k=n-T}^{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big[\mathrm{e}^{V(w_n)} \frac{1_{\{M_n=V(w_n)\le \alpha_n - x,\, \min_{k\le j\le n} V(w_j) \ge \alpha_n - x - L,\, \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(w_n)} = k\}}}{\sum_{\overleftarrow{v}=w_{k-1}} \eta_{n-k}(v)\, 1_{\{M_{n-k}(v)=V(w_n)-V(v)\}}},\, \mathcal{E}_n(x)\Big] + O(\varepsilon)\mathrm{e}^{-x} \\ &= \sum_{k=n-T}^{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big[A_{(5.7)}(k)\Big] + O(\varepsilon)\mathrm{e}^{-x}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

where

$$A_{(5.7)}(k) := \mathrm{e}^{V(w_n)} \frac{1_{\{M_n=V(w_n)\le \alpha_n - x,\, \min_{k\le j\le n} V(w_j) \ge \alpha_n - x - L,\, \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(w_n)} = k\}}}{\sum_{\overleftarrow{v}=w_{k-1}} \eta_{n-k}(v)\, 1_{\{M_{n-k}(v)=V(w_n)-V(v)\}}}, \qquad n - T \le k \le n,$$

and the last equality in (5.7) still holds thanks to (5.4). Obviously the following upper bound holds:

$$A_{(5.7)}(k) \le \mathrm{e}^{V(w_n)}\, 1_{\{V(w_n)\le \alpha_n - x, \min_{k\le j\le n} V(w_j) \ge \alpha_n - x - L, \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(w_n)} = k\}} =: B_{(5.8)}(k) \tag{5.8}$$

Moreover, under $\mathbb{Q}$, $(V(w_j), j \ge 0)$ is distributed as the random walk $(S_j, j \ge 0)$ under $\mathbf{P}$. Then

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\left[B_{(5.8)}(k)\right] \le \mathrm{e}^{\alpha_n - x} \mathbf{P}\Big(S_n \le \alpha_n - x, \min_{k\le j\le n} S_j \ge \alpha_n - x - L, \tau_{\zeta_n} = k\Big) \le K\, \mathrm{e}^{-x}, \tag{5.9}$$

by using (3.12).

In view of the hypothesis (1.10) which only holds for those functions with compact support, we need to truncate $|\Delta V(w_k) - \Delta V(v)|$ uniformly on $v \in \mathbb{B}(w_k)$. This is possible thanks to the following Claim:

Claim 5.2. *There exists some $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(\varepsilon, L, T) > 0$ such that for all $\lambda \ge \lambda_0$, if we define the event $\Upsilon_k(\lambda, n, T)$ by*

$$\Upsilon_k(\lambda, n, T)^c := \Big\{\exists v \in \mathbb{B}(w_k) : |\Delta V(w_k) - \Delta V(v)| > \lambda, M_{n-k}(v) \le V(w_n) - V(v)\Big\}, \qquad n - T \le k \le n,$$

then

$$\sum_{k=n-T}^{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big[B_{(5.8)}(k), \Upsilon_k(\lambda,n,T)^c\Big] \le O(\varepsilon)\,\mathrm{e}^{-x},$$

in particular,

$$\sum_{k=n-T}^{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big[A_{(5.7)}(k), \Upsilon_k(\lambda,n,T)^c\Big] \le O(\varepsilon)\,\mathrm{e}^{-x}.$$

Observe that on $\Upsilon_k(\lambda,n,T)$, for any $v \in \mathbb{B}(w_k)$ satisfying that $|\Delta V(w_k) - \Delta V(v)| > \lambda$, we have that $M_{n-k}(v) > V(w_n) - V(v)$, hence the subtree $\mathbb{T}^{(v)}$ contains a possible (global) minimum only if $v \in \mathbb{B}_\lambda(w_k)$, where

$$\mathbb{B}_\lambda(w_k) := \Big\{v \in \mathbb{B}(w_k) : |\Delta V(w_k) - \Delta V(v)| \le \lambda\Big\}, \qquad n-T \le k \le n. \tag{5.10}$$

It follows that on $\Upsilon_k(\lambda,n,T)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\overleftarrow{v}=w_{k-1}} \eta_{n-k}(v)\,1_{\{M_{n-k}(v)=V(w_n)-V(v)\}} \\
&= \eta_{n-k}(w_k) + \sum_{v\in\mathbb{B}_\lambda(w_k)} \eta_{n-k}(v)\,1_{\{M_{n-k}(v)=V(w_n)-V(w_k)+\Delta V(w_k)-\Delta V(v)\}} \\
&=: I_{(5.11)},
\end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

whereas

$$\begin{aligned}
1_{\{M_n=V(w_n)\}} &= 1_{\{M_{n-k}(w_k)=V(w_n)-V(w_k)\}} \prod_{v\in\mathbb{B}_\lambda(w_k)} 1_{\{M_{n-k}(v)\ge V(w_n)-V(w_k)+\Delta V(w_k)-\Delta V(v)\}} \\
&=: J_{(5.12)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

Therefore on $\Upsilon_k(\lambda,n,T)$,

$$A_{(5.7)}(k) = B_{(5.8)}(k)\frac{J_{(5.12)}}{I_{(5.11)}}, \tag{5.13}$$

which is the key to truncate the point measure $\sum_{v\in\mathbb{B}(w_k)}\delta_{\{V(w_k)-V(v)\}}$ to $\sum_{v\in\mathbb{B}_\lambda(w_k)}\delta_{\{V(w_k)-V(v)\}}$.

Before using (5.13), we give the proof of Claim 5.2.

Proof of Claim 5.2. By (1.12), there exists some $\lambda_1 > 0$ and some $z_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for all $\lambda \ge \lambda_1$ and $z \le z_0$,

$$\mathbb{Q}\Big(\cup_{v\in\mathbb{B}(w_k)}\{\Delta V(w_k) - \Delta V(v) \ge \lambda\}\,\Big|\,\Delta V(w_k) = z\Big) \le \frac{\varepsilon}{T}, \tag{5.14}$$

where we remark that the probability term in (5.14) does not depend on k. Observe that for all large n [such that $-\zeta_n \le z_0$], on $\{\Delta V(w_k) \le -\zeta_n\}$, $\mathbb{Q}\Big(\cup_{v\in\mathbb{B}(w_k)}\{\Delta V(w_k) - \Delta V(v) \ge \lambda\}\,\Big|\,B_{(5.8)}(k)\Big) = \mathbb{Q}\Big(\cup_{v\in\mathbb{B}(w_k)}\{\Delta V(w_k) - \Delta V(v) \ge \lambda\}\,\Big|\,\Delta V(w_k)\Big) \le \frac{\varepsilon}{T}$ by (5.14). It follows that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\left[B_{(5.8)}(k), \cup_{v\in\mathbb{B}(w_k)}\{\Delta V(w_k) - \Delta V(v) \ge \lambda\}\right] \le \frac{\varepsilon}{T}\mathbb{E}\left[B_{(5.8)}(k)\right] \le K\frac{\varepsilon}{T}\mathrm{e}^{-x}.$$

Write $\#\mathbb{B}(w_k) = \sum_{v\in\mathbb{B}(w_k)} 1$. By (1.11) we may choose a large constant λ_2 and some $z_0 < 0$ such that for all $z \le z_0$,

$$\mathbb{Q}\Big(\#\mathbb{B}(w_k) > \lambda_2 \,\Big|\, \Delta V(w_k) = z\Big) \le \frac{\varepsilon}{T}, \qquad \forall\, k \ge 1.$$

We notice that the above probability does not depend on k.

Now, we treat the case $\Delta V(w_k) - \Delta V(v) < -\lambda$: At first,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big[B_{(5.8)}(k), V(w_n) - V(w_k) \ge \lambda_3\Big] \\
\le\ & \mathrm{e}^{\alpha_n - x}\,\mathbf{P}\Big(S_n \le \alpha_n - x, \min_{k\le j\le n} S_j \ge \alpha_n - x - L, \tau_{\zeta_n} = k, S_n - S_k > \lambda_3\Big) \\
\le\ & \frac{\varepsilon}{T}\,\mathrm{e}^{-x}, \qquad (5.15)
\end{aligned}$$

by applying (3.13) and by choosing a constant $\lambda_3 = \lambda_3(\varepsilon, T, L)$ large enough. For those $v \in \mathbb{B}(w_k)$ such that the event $\Upsilon_k(\lambda, n, T)^c$ holds, if furthermore $\Delta V(w_k) - \Delta V(v) < -\lambda$ and $V(w_n) - V(w_k) < \lambda_3$, then $M_{n-k}(v) < -\lambda + \lambda_3$ which holds with a probability bounded from above by $\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda+\lambda_3}$ (see Lemma 4.1).

Recall that under $\mathbb{Q}$, $(\Delta V(w_j), \sum_{v\in\mathbb{B}(w_j)} \delta_{\{\Delta V(v)\}}, j \ge 1)$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables, whereas conditioning on $\mathcal{G}$, for $v \in \mathbb{B}(w_k)$, $(\eta_{n-k}(v), M_{n-k}(v))$ are independent and are distributed as (η_{n-k}, M_{n-k}) under $\mathbb{P}$. It follows from (5.15) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big[B_{(5.8)}(k), \exists v \in \mathbb{B}(w_k) : \Delta V(w_k) - \Delta V(v) < -\lambda, M_{n-k}(v) \le V(w_n) - V(v)\Big] \\
&\le \frac{\varepsilon}{T}\,\mathrm{e}^{-x} + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big[B_{(5.8)}(k) \times \big(1_{\{\#\mathbb{B}(w_k)>\lambda_2\}} + \lambda_2 \times \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda+\lambda_3}\big)\Big] \\
&\le \frac{\varepsilon}{T}\,\mathrm{e}^{-x} + \lambda_2 \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda+\lambda_3}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big[B_{(5.8)}(k)\Big] + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big[B_{(5.8)}(k) 1_{\{\#\mathbb{B}(w_k)>\lambda_2\}}\Big] =: C_{(5.16)}. \qquad (5.16)
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\Delta V(w_k) \le -\zeta_n \le z_0$, we have $\mathbb{Q}\Big(\#\mathbb{B}(w_k) > \lambda_2 \,\Big|\, \mathcal{G}\Big) = \mathbb{Q}\Big(\#\mathbb{B}(w_k) > \lambda_2 \,\Big|\, \Delta V(w_k)\Big) \le \frac{\varepsilon}{T}$. Then we deduce from (5.9) that

$$C_{(5.16)} \le \frac{\varepsilon}{T}\,\mathrm{e}^{-x} + \lambda_2 \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda+\lambda_3} K \mathrm{e}^{-x} + \frac{\varepsilon}{T} K \mathrm{e}^{-x} = O(\varepsilon)\mathrm{e}^{-x},$$

for all λ large enough [λ_2 and λ_3 being fixed]. This and (5.15) yield Claim 5.2. □

Based on Claim 5.2 and (5.13), we obtain that for all $\lambda \ge \lambda_0(\varepsilon, L, T)$, n large enough and $x \ge x_1$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(M_n \le \alpha_n - x) &= \sum_{k=n-T}^{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big[A_{(5.7)}(k),\ \Upsilon_k(\lambda, n, T)\Big] + O(\varepsilon)\mathrm{e}^{-x} \\
&= \sum_{k=n-T}^{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big[B_{(5.8)}(k)\frac{J_{(5.12)}}{I_{(5.11)}}\,\Upsilon_k(\lambda, n, T)\Big] + O(\varepsilon)\mathrm{e}^{-x} \\
&= \sum_{k=n-T}^{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big[B_{(5.8)}(k)\frac{J_{(5.12)}}{I_{(5.11)}}\Big] + O(\varepsilon)\mathrm{e}^{-x}, \qquad (5.17)
\end{aligned}$$

by using again Claim 5.2. Write again for brevity

$$y \equiv y(n, x, L) := \alpha_n - x - L.$$

Observe that $\{\tau_{\zeta_n}^{(w_n)} = k\} = \{\tau_{\zeta_n}^{(w_k)} = k\}$. In view of (5.11) and (5.12), we deduce from the Markov property at k that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big[B_{(5.8)}(k)\frac{J_{(5.12)}}{I_{(5.11)}}\Big] \\
&= \mathrm{e}^{\alpha_n - x}\,\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\left[1_{\{\tau_{\zeta_n}^{(w_k)}=k, V(w_k)\geq y\}} F_{n-k}^{(L)}\Big(V(w_k)-y, \sum_{v\in\mathbb{B}_\lambda(w_k)}\delta_{\{\Delta V(w_k)-\Delta V(v)\}}\Big)\right], \qquad (5.18)
\end{aligned}$$

where for any $j \geq 0$, $F_j^{(L)} : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathcal{M} \to [0,1]$ is the measurable function defined as follows: for any $\theta \in \mathcal{M}$, say $\theta = \sum_{i=1}^l \delta_{\{y_i\}}$ with some $l \geq 1$ and $|y_i| \leq \lambda$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&F_j^{(L)}(s,\theta) \\
&:= \mathrm{e}^{s-L}\,\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big[\mathrm{e}^{V(w_j)}\frac{1_{\{M_j=V(w_j)\}}\,1_{\{V(w_j)\leq L-s, \underline{V}(w_j)\geq -s\}}}{\eta_j + \sum_{i=1}^l \eta_j^{(i)} 1_{\{M_j^{(i)}=V(w_j)+y_i\}}} \prod_{1\leq i\leq l,\,\eta_j^{(i)}\neq 0} 1_{\{M_j^{(i)}\geq V(w_j)+y_i\}}\Big], \qquad (5.19)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\underline{V}(w_j) := \min_{0\leq i\leq j} V(w_i)$ and under $\mathbb{Q}$, $(\eta_j^{(i)}, M_j^{(i)}, j\geq 0)_{i\geq 1}$ is i.i.d., independent of everything else and distributed as $(\eta_j, M_j, j\geq 0)$ under $\mathbb{P}$. We mention that if $\eta_j^{(i)} = 0$, then $M_j^{(i)} = \infty$ by definition. Obviously, the above expectation under $\mathbb{Q}$ does not depend on the order of $\{y_i\}$ in θ. Recall that under $\mathbb{Q}$, $(\Delta V(w_k), \sum_{v\in\mathbb{B}(w_k)}\delta_{\{\Delta V(v)\}})_{k\geq 1}$ are i.i.d., and $(V(w_j), j\geq 0)$ is distributed as $(S_j, j\geq 0)$ under $\mathbf{P}$. If we define

$$G_j^{(\lambda,L)}(s,z) := \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big[F_j^{(L)}\Big(s, \sum_{v\in\mathbb{B}_\lambda(w_1)}\delta_{\{V(w_1)-V(v)\}}\Big)\,\Big|\, V(w_1)=z\Big], \qquad j\geq 0,\ s,z\in\mathbb{R}, \qquad (5.20)$$

then

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big[B_{(5.8)}(k)\frac{J_{(5.12)}}{I_{(5.11)}}\Big] = \mathrm{e}^{\alpha_n - x}\,\mathbf{E}\left[1_{\{\tau_{\zeta_n}=k, S_k\geq y\}}\, G_{n-k}^{(\lambda,L)}\Big(S_k - y, X_k\Big)\right], \qquad (5.21)$$

where as before, $X_k = S_k - S_{k-1}$. For any $j\geq 0$, notice that $\eta_j \geq 1_{\{V(w_j)=M_j\}}$, hence $F_j^{(\lambda,L)}(s,z,\theta) \leq \mathrm{e}^{s-L}\,\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\mathrm{e}^{V(w_j)}1_{\{V(w_j)\leq L-s, \underline{V}(w_j)\geq -s\}}\right] \leq \mathbb{Q}\big(V(w_j)\leq L-s\big) = \mathbf{P}(S_j\leq L-s)$. It follows that for any $s\geq 0$ and $z\in\mathbb{R}$,

$$G_j^{(\lambda,L)}(s,z) \leq \mathbf{P}(S_j\leq L-s) \leq j\,\mathbf{P}(X\leq \frac{L-s}{j}) \leq K_{j,L}(1+s)^{-\alpha}, \qquad (5.22)$$

with some constant $K_{j,L} > 0$.

Recalling (1.10), let $\Xi = \sum_{i=1}^{\nu^*}\delta_{\{y_i^*\}}$, $y_i^* \in \mathbb{R}\cup\{-\infty\}$ be a point process independent of everything else whose law is defined as the limiting law of $\sum_{w\in\mathbb{B}(w_1)}\delta_{\{V(w_1)-V(v)\}}$ conditioned on $\{V(w_1)=z\}$ as $z\to-\infty$. We claim that as $z\to-\infty$, for any $s\geq 0$,

$$G_j^{(\lambda,L)}(s,z) \text{ converges to } G_j^{(\lambda,L)}(s), \qquad (5.23)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
&G_j^{(\lambda,L)}(s) \\
&:= \mathrm{e}^{s-L}\,\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big[\mathrm{e}^{V(w_j)}\frac{1_{\{M_j=V(w_j)\}}\,1_{\{V(w_j)\leq L-s, \underline{V}(w_j)\geq -s\}}}{\eta_j + \sum_{1\leq i\leq\nu^*:|y_i^*|\leq\lambda}\eta_j^{(i)}1_{\{M_j^{(i)}=V(w_j)+y_i^*\}}} \prod_{1\leq i\leq\nu^*:\eta_j^{(i)}\neq 0,|y_i^*|\leq\lambda} 1_{\{M_j^{(i)}\geq V(w_j)+y_i^*\}}\Big],
\end{aligned}$$

with the usual convention $\prod_{\emptyset} := 1$. Moreover,

$$\int_0^\infty G_j^{(\lambda,L)}(s)ds = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big[\big(\mathrm{e}^{-V(w_j)} - \mathrm{e}^{-L-\underline{V}(w_j)}\big)\frac{1_{\{M_j=V(w_j)\}}\,1_{\{V(w_j)\le L\}}}{\eta_j + \sum_{1\le i\le \nu^*:|y_i^*|\le\lambda}\eta_j^{(i)}1_{\{M_j^{(i)}=V(w_j)+y_i^*\}}} \prod_{1\le i\le\nu^*:\eta_j^{(i)}\neq 0,|y_i^*|\le\lambda} 1_{\{M_j^{(i)}\ge V(w_j)+y_i^*,|y_i^*|\le\lambda\}}\Big].$$

Let us postpone for the moment the proof of (5.23). By assembling (5.17) and (5.18), we get that for any $x \ge x_1$, $L \ge L_1$ and large T, for all large $n \ge n_0(\varepsilon, L, T)$,

$$\mathbb{P}(M_n \le \alpha_n - x) = \mathrm{e}^{\alpha_n - x}\sum_{j=0}^{T-1}\mathbf{E}\left[1_{\{\tau_{\zeta_n}=n-j, S_{n-j}\ge y\}}\,G_j^{(\lambda,L)}(S_{n-j}-y,\ X_{n-j})\right] + O(\varepsilon)\,\mathrm{e}^{-x}. \tag{5.24}$$

By means of (5.22) and (5.23), we can apply Lemma 3.6 to $G_j^{(\lambda,L)}(s,z)$, for any fixed $0 \le j < T$. This gives that for any $L \ge L_1$ and large T, for all large $n \ge n_1(\varepsilon, L, T)$ and $x \in [x_1, \frac{n}{\log n}]$,

$$\left|\mathbb{P}\left(M_n \le \alpha_n - x\right) - \mathfrak{m}^{-(\alpha+1)}\mathrm{e}^{-x}\sum_{j=0}^{T-1}\int_0^\infty G_j^{(\lambda,L)}(s)ds\right| \le O(\varepsilon)\,\mathrm{e}^{-x}. \tag{5.25}$$

On the other hand, we deduce from the bounded convergence theorem (when λ tends to ∞) and monotone convergence theorem (when T and L tend to ∞) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{L\to\infty}\lim_{T\to\infty}\lim_{\lambda\to\infty}\mathfrak{m}^{-(\alpha+1)}\sum_{j=0}^{T-1}\int_0^\infty G_j^{(\lambda,L)}(u)du\\
&= \mathfrak{m}^{-(\alpha+1)}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\mathrm{e}^{-V(w_j)}\frac{1_{\{M_j=V(w_j)\}}}{\eta_j + \sum_{i=1}^{\nu^*}\eta_j^{(i)}1_{\{M_j^{(i)}=V(w_j)+y_i^*\}}}\prod_{i=1}^{\nu^*}1_{\{M_j^{(i)}\ge V(w_j)+y_i^*\}}\right]\\
&=: c_*,
\end{aligned} \tag{5.26}$$

[in the product $\prod_{i=1}^{\nu^*}$, if $\eta_j^{(i)} = 0$ then $M_j^{(i)} = \infty$ by definition], moreover by Proposition 1.1 we know that c_* is a finite constant. By combining (5.25) and (5.26) we get Proposition 2.1.

It remains to check (5.23). If we denote by $\mathbf{e}$ an independent standard exponential variable, then we may rewrite (5.19) as

$$\begin{aligned}
F_j^{(L)}(s,\theta) &= \mathrm{e}^{s-L}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big[\mathrm{e}^{V(w_j)}1_{\{M_j=V(w_j)\}}\,1_{\{V(w_j)\le L-s,\underline{V}(w_j)\ge -s\}}\mathrm{e}^{-\mathbf{e}(\eta_j-1)}\\
&\qquad\times\prod_{1\le i\le l,\eta_j^{(i)}\neq 0}1_{\{M_j^{(i)}\ge V(w_j)+y_i\}}\mathrm{e}^{-\mathbf{e}\,\eta_j^{(i)}1_{\{M_j^{(i)}=V(w_j)+y_i\}}}\Big]\\
&= \mathrm{e}^{s-L}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\mathrm{e}^{V(w_j)}1_{\{M_j=V(w_j)\}}\,1_{\{V(w_j)\le L-s,\underline{V}(w_j)\ge -s\}}\mathrm{e}^{-\mathbf{e}(\eta_j-1)-\sum_{i=1}^{l}h^{(\lambda)}_{j,\mathbf{e},V(w_j)}(y_i)}\right],
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that $(\eta_j^{(i)}, M_j^{(i)}, j \geq 0)_{i\geq 1}$ is i.i.d., independent of everything else and distributed as $(\eta_j, M_j, j \geq 0)$ under $\mathbb{P}$, and for any $a > 0, b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$ [remark that $|y_i| \leq \lambda$ when $\theta = \sum_{v\in\mathbb{B}_\lambda(w_1)} \delta_{\{V(w_1)-V(v)\}}$],

$$h^{(\lambda)}_{j,a,b}(x) := -1_{\{|x|\leq\lambda\}} \log \mathbb{E}\Big[1_{\{\eta_j=0\}} + 1_{\{\eta_j\neq 0, M_j\geq b+x\}} \mathrm{e}^{-a\eta_j 1_{\{M_j=b+x\}}}\Big].$$

Then (5.23) follows from the assumption (1.10) and an application of dominated convergence theorem. The proof of Proposition 2.1 is now completed. □

6 Proof of Proposition 5.1

Fix $0 < \varrho < \min(\frac{\alpha-1}{2}, \frac{1}{12})$. Recall (1.6) that $\mathbb{B}(u)$ is the set of brothers of u for any $u \in \mathbb{T}\backslash\{\varnothing\}$. Let $B > 0$ be a large constant and J be a large integer. Recall (4.3) and (4.4).

Let us say that $u \in \mathbb{T}_n$ is a good vertex if for any $x \geq 0$,

$$\tau^{(2,u)}_{\zeta_n} > n \geq \tau^{(u)}_{\zeta_n} > J, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{v\in\mathbb{B}(u_k)} \mathrm{e}^{-(V(v)+x)} \leq \begin{cases} \mathrm{e}^{B-x}, & \text{if } 1 \leq k \leq J, \\ \mathrm{e}^{-k^\varrho}, & \text{if } J < k < \tau^{(u)}_{\zeta_n}. \end{cases} \tag{6.1}$$

The condition $\{n \geq \tau^{(u)}_{\zeta_n} > J\}$ will be automatically satisfied in the event that we are interested in. Roughly saying, when w_n is good, the contribution from the particles in $\mathbb{B}(w_k)$, for all $k < \tau^{(w_n)}_{\zeta_n}$, is not too large. The following lemma estimates the case when w_n is not good:

Lemma 6.1. *Under (1.1), (1.4) and (1.7), for any $L, T, \varepsilon > 0$, there exists $J(L, T, \varepsilon)$ such that for all $J \geq J(L, T, \varepsilon)$, there exists $B(J, L, T, \varepsilon) > 0$ such that for all $B \geq B(J, L, T, \varepsilon)$, for any n large enough and $x \geq 0$,*

$$\mathbb{Q}\Big(V(w_n) \leq \alpha_n - x, \min_{\tau^{(w_n)}_{\zeta_n}\leq j\leq n} V(w_j) \geq \alpha_n - x - L, \tau^{(w_n)}_{\zeta_n} \in [n-T, n], \ w_n \text{ not good}\Big) \leq \varepsilon\, \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n}. \tag{6.2}$$

By admitting Lemma 6.1 for the moment, we give now the proof of Proposition 5.1:

Proof of Proposition 5.1. For brevity we use the following notation:

$$F_n \equiv F_{n,T,x} := \Big\{V(w_n) \leq \alpha_n - x, \min_{\tau^{(w_n)}_{\zeta_n}\leq i\leq n} V(w_j) \geq \alpha_n - x - L, \tau^{(w_n)}_{\zeta_n} \in [n-T, n]\Big\} \tag{6.3}$$

By (6.2), it remains to estimate the following probability:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Q}_{(6.4)} &:= \mathbb{Q}\Big(F_n, w_n \text{ good}, (\mathcal{E}_n(x))^c\Big) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big[1_{\{F_n,\, w_n \text{ good}\}} \sum_{j=1}^{\tau^{(w_n)}_{\zeta_n}-1} \sum_{v\in\mathbb{B}(w_j)} 1_{\{\min_{u\geq v,\,|u|=n} V(u)\leq\alpha_n-x\}}\Big] \\ &\leq \sum_{t=n-T}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{t-1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big[1_{\{F_n,\, t=\tau_{\zeta_n}(w_n),\, w_n \text{ good}\}} \sum_{v\in\mathbb{B}(w_j)} 1_{\{\min_{u\geq v,\,|u|=n} V(u)\leq\alpha_n-x\}}\Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

By the spinal decomposition (Proposition 1.4 (iii)), for any $t \in [n-T, n]$, $j \in [1, t-1]$ and $v \in \mathbb{B}(w_j)$, conditionally on $\mathcal{G}$ and on $\{V(v) = b\}$, we have

$$\mathbb{Q}\Big(\min_{u \geq v,\, |u|=n} V(u) \leq \alpha_n - x \,\big|\, \mathcal{G}\Big) = \mathbb{P}\big(M_{n-j} \leq \alpha_n - x - b\big).$$

If $j \leq \frac{2n}{3}$, we apply Proposition 1.1 to get that $\mathbb{P}\big(M_{n-j} \leq \alpha_n - x - b\big) \leq K\,\mathrm{e}^{-(b+x+\alpha_{n-j}-\alpha_n)}$, whereas if $\frac{2n}{3} < j \leq t$, we apply Lemma 4.1 (which holds obviously for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$) and get that $\mathbb{P}\big(M_{n-j} \leq \alpha_n - x - b\big) \leq \mathrm{e}^{-(b+x-\alpha_n)}$. Taking into account the fact that w_n is good, we obtain

$$\mathbf{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big[\sum_{v \in \mathbb{B}(w_j)} 1_{\{\min_{u \geq v,\, |u|=n} V(u) \leq \alpha_n - x\}} \,\big|\, \mathcal{G}\Big] \leq \begin{cases} 2K\,\mathrm{e}^{\alpha_n - \alpha_{n-j}}\mathrm{e}^{B-x}, & \text{if } j \leq J, \\ K\,\mathrm{e}^{\alpha_n - \alpha_{n-j}}\mathrm{e}^{-j^{\varrho}}, & \text{if } j \in (J, \frac{2}{3}n], \\ \mathrm{e}^{\alpha_n}\mathrm{e}^{-j^{\varrho}}, & \text{if } j \in (\frac{2}{3}n, t]. \end{cases}$$

By summing these inequalities, for n large enough we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Q}_{(6.4)} &\leq K'(J\,\mathrm{e}^{B-x} + \mathrm{e}^{-J^{\varrho/2}}) \sum_{t=n-T}^{n} \mathbb{Q}\Big(F_n,\, t = \tau_{\zeta_n}(w_n),\, w_n \text{ good}\Big) \\ &\leq K'(J\,\mathrm{e}^{B-x} + \mathrm{e}^{-J^{\varrho/2}}) \sum_{t=n-T}^{n} \mathbf{P}\left(S_n \leq \alpha_n - x,\, \min_{\tau_{\zeta_n} \leq i \leq n} S_i \geq \alpha_n - x - L,\, t = \tau_{\zeta_n},\, \tau^{(2)}_{\zeta_n} > n\right) \\ &\leq K''(J\,\mathrm{e}^{B-x} + \mathrm{e}^{-J^{\varrho/2}})(1+L)\,T\,\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n}, \end{aligned}$$

where for the second inequality we have used (4.1) for $F_n \cap \{t = \tau_{\zeta_n}(w_n)\}$ and for the last inequality, we have applied (3.15) to $y = \alpha_n - x - L$ and $a = 1, ..., \lceil L \rceil$). Finally we choose $J = J(L, T, K'')$ large enough and $x \geq x_1(B, J)$ so that $K''(J\,\mathrm{e}^{B-x} + \mathrm{e}^{-J^{\varrho/2}})(1+L)\,T \leq \varepsilon$. Then $\mathbb{Q}_{(6.4)} \leq \varepsilon \mathrm{e}^{-x}$ and (5.3) follows. This proves Proposition 5.1. □

We end this section by the proof of Lemma 6.1.

Proof of Lemma 6.1.

Firstly we will prove that with overwhelm probability the trajectory of $(V(w_i))_{i \geq 0}$ contains only one big jump and never drops too low. Recall the notation F_n defined in (6.3). Write for brevity

$$y := \alpha_n - x - L.$$

We shall use several times the fact that under $\mathbb{Q}$, $(V(w_j), j \geq 0)$ has the same law as $(S_j, j \geq 0)$ under $\mathbf{P}$. Then by (3.14) with $a = 0, 1, ..., \lceil L \rceil$, we get that for some constant $K_L > 0$ depending on L,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Q}\left(F_n, \tau^{(2,w_n)}_{\zeta_n} \leq n\right) &= \sum_{i=n-T}^{n} \mathbf{P}\left(\underline{S}_{[\tau_{\zeta_n}, n]} \geq y,\, \tau_{\zeta_n} = i,\, S_n \in [y, y+L],\, \tau^{(2)}_{\zeta_n} \leq n\right) \\ &\leq K_L \sum_{i=n-T}^{n} n^{-2\alpha} i^{-1/\alpha} \ell_3(n) \leq \varepsilon\,\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n}, \end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

for all large n. We claim that there exists some positive constant $c_4 = c_4(L, T)$ such that for all n large,

$$\mathbb{Q}\Big(F_n,\, \min_{1 \leq j < \tau^{(w_n)}_{\zeta_n}} V(w_j) \leq -c_4,\, \tau^{(2,w_n)}_{\zeta_n} > n\Big) \leq O(\varepsilon)\,\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n}. \tag{6.6}$$

Let us denote by $\mathbb{Q}_{(6.6)}$ the probability term in (6.6). Denote by j be the first time such that $V(w_j) \le -c_4$; then by using the Markov property at j, we get that

$$\mathbb{Q}_{(6.6)} = \sum_{i=n-T}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathbf{E}\Big[1_{\{\underline{S}_{j-1} > -c_4,\, S_j \le -c_4,\, \min_{k\le j} X_k \ge -\zeta_n\}} \times \mathbf{P}_{S_j}\Big(S_{n-j} \le y + L,\, \min_{\tau_{\zeta_n} \le i \le n-j} S_i \ge y,\, \tau_{\zeta_n} = i - j,\, \tau^{(2)}_{\zeta_n} > n - j\Big)\Big]$$

If $j \ge \frac{n}{2}$ by Lemma 3.1 (with $x = \mathtt{m}\, j + c_4$ and $y = \zeta_n$ there) we get that

$$\mathbf{P}\big(S_j \le -c_4,\, \min_{k\le j} X_k \ge -\zeta_n\big) \le K \mathrm{e}^{-(\log n)^3/K},$$

whereas for $j \le \frac{n}{2}$, since $y - S_j \le y + c_4 + \zeta_n \le \frac{\mathtt{m}}{2}(n-j)$, by using $\lceil L \rceil$ times (3.15) (with $a \in [0, L]$ being integer), we deduce that for any $i \in [n-T, n]$ and on $\{S_j \le -c_4,\, \min_{k\le j} X_k \ge -\zeta_n\}$,

$$\mathbf{P}_{S_j}\Big(S_{n-j} \le y + L,\, \underline{S}_{[\tau_{\zeta_n}, n-j]} \ge y,\, \tau_{\zeta_n} = i - j,\, \tau^{(2)}_{\zeta_n} > n - j\Big) \le K'\,(1 + L)\,\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n} \tag{6.7}$$

(we used the fact that $\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_{n-j}} = O(\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n})$ when $j \le \frac{n}{2}$). It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{Q}_{(6.6)} &\le \sum_{i=n-T}^{n} \sum_{j=\frac{n}{2}}^{i-1} K \mathrm{e}^{-(\log n)^3/K} + K'\,(1+L)\,\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n} \sum_{i=n-T}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{\frac{n}{2}} \mathbf{P}\Big(\underline{S}_{j-1} \ge -c_4,\, S_j < -c_4\Big) \\
&\le \varepsilon\, \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n} + K'\,(1+L)\,T\,\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n} \sum_{j=1}^{\frac{n}{2}} \mathbf{P}\left(\underline{S}_{j-1} \ge -c_4,\, S_j < -c_4\right) \\
&\le \varepsilon\, \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n} + K'\,(1+L)\,T\ \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n}\, \mathbf{P}\left(\min_{k\ge 0} S_k < -c_4\right) \\
&\le 2\varepsilon\, \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n},
\end{aligned}$$

by choosing $c_4 = c_4(L, T)$ large enough to get the last inequality. Then (6.6) follows.

By combining (6.5) and (6.6), to get Lemma 6.1 it is enough to prove the following assertion: *for any L, T, $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist $B > 0$ and J such that for any $n \ge n_0(J, B, L, T, \varepsilon)$, $x \ge 0$,*

$$\mathbb{Q}\Big(F_n,\, \min_{1 \le j < \tau^{(w_n)}_{\zeta_n}} V(w_j) \ge -c_4,\, \tau^{(2,w_n)}_{\zeta_n} > n,\ \ w_n \text{ not good}\Big) \le O(\varepsilon)\, \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n}. \tag{6.8}$$

Recall that $0 < \varrho < \min(\frac{\alpha-1}{2}, \frac{1}{12})$. Before establishing (6.8) we prove the following claim:

Claim 6.2. *(i) There is a sequence of positive real numbers (ε_j) such that $\lim_{j\to\infty} \varepsilon_j = 0$ and for any integer j and $z \in \mathbb{R}$, $y \ge 0$,*

$$\sum_{p=j}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}\left(S_p - p^{\varrho} \le z,\, \underline{S}_p \ge -y\right) \le \frac{10}{\mathtt{m}} \left(z - \frac{\mathtt{m}\, j}{10}\right)^{+} + \varepsilon_j (1 + y + z^{+}). \tag{6.9}$$

(ii) There exits some positive constant $K_{L,T} > 0$ such that for all large n and $k \in [1, n - T)$,

$$\sup_{z \le -\frac{mn}{5}} \mathbf{P}\left(S_{n-k} \le z,\, \min_{\tau_{\zeta_n} \le i \le n-k} S_i \ge z - L,\, \tau_{\zeta_n} \in [n-k-T, n-k],\, \tau^{(2)}_{\zeta_n} > n - k\right) \le K_{L,T}\, \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n}. \tag{6.10}$$

Proof of Claim 6.2.

(i) Observe that

$$\sum_{p\geq j}\mathbf{P}\left(S_p-p^\varrho\leq z,\,\underline{S}_p\geq -y\right)\;\leq\;\left(\frac{10}{m}z-j\right)^+ + \sum_{p\geq\max(\frac{10z}{m},j)}\mathbf{P}\left(S_p\in[-y,z+p^\varrho]\right).$$

Then observe that $z+p^\varrho\leq\frac{\mathtt{m}}{2}p$ for all $p\geq\frac{10z}{m}$ and $p\geq j_0$ if j_0 is large enough. By applying Lemma 3.4, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{p\geq j}\mathbf{P}\left(S_p-p^\varrho\leq z,\,\underline{S}_p\geq -y\right)\;&\leq\;\frac{10}{\mathtt{m}}\left(z-\frac{\mathtt{m}\,j}{10}\right)^+ + K\sum_{p\geq\max(\frac{10z}{m},j)}\frac{l(p)(y+z^+ +p^\varrho)}{p^\alpha}\\ &\leq\;\frac{10}{\mathtt{m}}\left(z-\frac{\mathtt{m}\,j}{10}\right)^+ +\varepsilon_j(1+y+z^+),\end{aligned}$$

with $\varepsilon=O(j^{(1-\alpha)/2})$, proving (6.9).

(ii) Denote by $\mathbf{P}_{(6.10)}$ the probability term in (6.10). Then

$$\mathbf{P}_{(6.10)}=\sum_{j=n-k-T}^{n-k}\mathbf{P}\left(S_{n-k}\leq z,\,\min_{j\leq i\leq n-k}S_i\geq z-L,\,\tau_{\zeta_n}=j,\,\tau^{(2)}_{\zeta_n}>n-k\right)=:\sum_{j=n-k-T}^{n-k}\mathbf{P}_{(6.10)}(j).$$

Notice that $z-L\leq S_{n-k}\leq z$. Therefore if $S':=S_{n-k}-X_j\geq-\frac{\mathtt{m}}{10}n$ then $X_j\leq z+\frac{\mathtt{m}}{10}n\leq-\frac{\mathtt{m}}{10}n$. Moreover $z-L-S'\leq X_j\leq z-S'$. By the independence of X_j and S', we get that

$$\mathbf{P}\left(z-L\leq S_{n-k}\leq z,\,\tau_{\zeta_n}=j,\,S'\geq-\frac{\mathtt{m}}{10}n\right)\leq\sup_{b\leq-\frac{\mathtt{m}}{10}n}\mathbf{P}\left(X_j\in[b-L,b]\right)\leq K_L\,\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n},$$

by using the density of X_j given by (1.4). On the other hand, if $S':=S_{n-k}-X_j<-\frac{\mathtt{m}}{10}n$ then we can apply Lemma 3.1 to see that

$$\mathbf{P}\left(S'<-\frac{\mathtt{m}}{10}n,\,\tau_{\zeta_n}=j,\,\tau^{(2)}_{\zeta_n}>n-k\right)\leq\mathbf{P}\left(S_{n-k-1}<-\frac{\mathtt{m}}{10}n,\tau_{\zeta_n}>n-k-1\right)\leq K\,\mathrm{e}^{-\mathtt{m}\,n/(10\zeta_n)}.$$

Therefore $\mathbf{P}_{(6.10)}(j)\leq K_L\,\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n}+K\,\mathrm{e}^{-\mathtt{m}\,n/(10\zeta_n)}$ and (6.10) follows if we take $K_{L,T}=2(1+T)K_L$. This completes the proof of Claim 6.2. □

Let us go back to the proof of (6.8). Define for any $k\geq1$, $\xi(w_k):=\sum_{v\in\mathbb{B}(w_k)}\mathrm{e}^{-\Delta V(v)}$. Then,

$$\sum_{v\in\mathbb{B}(w_k)}\mathrm{e}^{-(V(v)+x)}=\mathrm{e}^{-V(w_{k-1})-x}\xi(w_k).\tag{6.11}$$

Notice that the sequence $\{\xi(w_k),\Delta V(w_k)\}_{k\geq1}$ are i.i.d. under $\mathbb{Q}$. Define $\xi=\xi(w_1)$.

Let n be large enough so that $n-T>J$. On $\{\tau^{(2,w_n)}_{\zeta_n}>n\}\cap\{\,w_n$ not good$\}$, either there is some $1\leq k\leq J$ such that $\xi(w_k)>\mathrm{e}^{B+V(w_{k-1})}$ or some $J<k<\tau^{(w_n)}_{\zeta_n}$ such that $\xi(w_k)>\mathrm{e}^{V(w_{k-1})+x-k^\varrho}$. We discuss separately these two cases:

The first case: choice of J to control $J<k<\tau^{(w_n)}_{\zeta_n}$:

Notice that $\tau_{\zeta_n}^{(w_n)} \in [n-T, n]$. For any $J < k < n-T$, we apply the Markov property at k to arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{Q}_{(6.12)}(k) &:= \mathbb{Q}\Big(k < \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(w_n)},\, \xi(w_k) > \mathrm{e}^{x+V(w_{k-1})-k^\varrho},\, \min_{1\le j\le k} V(w_j) \ge -c_4,\, F_n,\, \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(2,w_n)} > n\Big) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big[1_{\{\xi(w_k)>\mathrm{e}^{x+V(w_{k-1})-k^\varrho},\, \min_{1\le j\le k} V(w_j)\ge -c_4,\, \min_{j\le k}\Delta V(w_j)\ge -\zeta_n\}}\, g_{n-k}(V(w_k))\Big], \quad (6.12)\end{aligned}$$

with

$$g_{n-k}(b) := \mathbf{P}\Big(S_{n-k} \le y-b+L,\, \min_{\tau_{\zeta_n}\le j\le n-k} S_j \ge y-b,\, \tau_{\zeta_n} \in [n-k-T, n-k],\, \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(2)} > n-k\Big),\ z \in \mathbb{R}.$$

When $k \le \frac{n}{2}$, we can apply (3.12) to get that for $b := V(w_k) \ge -c_4$,

$$g_{n-k}(b) \le K'_L\, \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n},$$

with some positive constant K'_L depending on L [in fact $K'_L = O(L^2)$].

For $k \ge \frac{n}{2}$, if $b := V(w_k) > \frac{\mathtt{m}n}{4}$, then $y + L - b \le \frac{-\mathtt{m}n}{5}$ and $g_{n-k}(b) \le K_{L,T}\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n}$ by (6.10). Consequently, we get that for any $J < k < n-T$ and $x \ge 0$,

$$\mathbb{Q}_{(6.12)}(k) \le K''_{L,T}\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n}\, \mathbb{Q}\Big(\xi(w_k) > \mathrm{e}^{V(w_{k-1})-k^\varrho}\Big) + 1_{\{k\ge\frac{n}{2}\}}\mathbb{Q}\Big(V(w_k) \le \frac{\mathtt{m}n}{4}, \min_{j\le k}\Delta V(w_j) \ge -\zeta_n\Big).$$

Moreover, $\mathbb{Q}\left(V(w_k) \le \frac{\mathtt{m}n}{4}, \min_{j\le k}\Delta V(w_j) \ge -\zeta_n\right) = \mathbf{P}\left(S_k \le \frac{\mathtt{m}n}{4}, \min_{j\le k} X_j \ge -\zeta_n\right) \le K\,\mathrm{e}^{-\mathtt{m}n/(4\zeta_n)}$ by Lemma 3.1. Since under $\mathbb{Q}$, $\xi(w_k)$ is independent of $V(w_{k-1})$ which is distributed as S_{k-1} under $\mathbf{P}$, and, moreover, $\xi(w_k)$ has the same law as ξ, it follows from (6.9) that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{J<k\le n-T} \mathbb{Q}_{(6.12)}(k) &\le K''_{T,L}\,\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n}\,\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big[\sum_{J<k\le n-T} \mathbf{P}(\log\xi(w_k) \ge S_{k-1} - k^\varrho,\, \underline{S}_{k-1} \ge -c_4\})\Big] + K\,n\,\mathrm{e}^{-\mathtt{m}n/(4\zeta_n)} \\ &\le K_{T,L}\,\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n}\left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big[(\log\xi - \frac{\mathtt{m}J}{10})^+\Big] + \varepsilon_J\,\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\big[1 + c_4 + (\log\xi)^+\big]\right) + K\,n\,\mathrm{e}^{-\mathtt{m}n/(4\zeta_n)},\end{aligned}$$

with $\varepsilon_J \to 0$ as $J \to \infty$. By (1.7), $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[(\log\xi)^+] \le \mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{|u|=1}\mathrm{e}^{-V(u)}\big(\log[\sum_{|u|=1}\mathrm{e}^{-V(u)}]\big)^+\Big] < \infty$, thus we choose and then fix $J = J(\varepsilon, T, L)$ large enough so that $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\left[(\log\xi - \frac{\mathtt{m}J}{10})^+\right] + \varepsilon_J\,\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\big[1 + c_4 + (\log\xi)^+\big]\right) \le \frac{\varepsilon}{K_{L,T}}$. Then for all large n, we get that

$$\sum_{J<k\le n-T} \mathbb{Q}_{(6.12)}(k) \le 2\varepsilon\,\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n}. \quad (6.13)$$

The second (and last) case: Choice of B to control $1 \le k \le J$:

Under $\mathbb{Q}$ and conditionally on $\{V(w_k) = z\}$, the process $\{V(w_{i+k}), 0 \le i \le n-k\}$ is distributed as $\{S_i, 0 \le i \le n-k\}$ under $\mathbf{P}_z$. It follows from the Markov property at k that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{Q}\Big(\xi(w_k) \ge \mathrm{e}^{B+V(w_{k-1})},\, F_n,\, \min_{1\le j\le k} V(w_j) \ge -c_4,\, \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(2,w_n)} > n\Big) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big[1_{\{\xi(w_k)\ge\mathrm{e}^{B+V(w_{k-1})},\, \min_{1\le j\le k} V(w_j)\ge -c_4\}} \times \\ &\qquad \mathbf{P}_{V(w_k)}\left(S_{n-k} \le y+L,\, \min_{\tau_{\zeta_n}-k\le j\le n-k} S_j \ge y,\, \tau_{\zeta_n} \in [n-k-T, n-k],\, \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(2)} > n-k\right)\Big] \\ &\le K_L\,\mathbb{Q}\left(\xi(w_k) \ge \mathrm{e}^{B+V(w_{k-1})},\, \min_{1\le j\le k} V(w_j) \ge -c_4\right)\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n},\end{aligned}$$

where $K_L > 0$ denotes some constant depending on L and we have applied (3.12) to get the last inequality [remark that $y - V(w_k) \le y + c_4 \le \frac{\mathtt{m}}{2}(n-k)$]. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\Big[\sum_{k=1}^{J} 1_{\{\log\xi(w_k)\ge B+V(w_{k-1}),\,\min_{1\le j\le k} V(w_j)\ge -c_4\}}\Big] &\le \sum_{k=1}^{J}\mathbb{Q}\left(V(w_{k-1})\le -\frac{B}{2}\right)+\sum_{k=1}^{J}\frac{2}{B}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\big[(\log(\xi(w_k)))^+\big]\\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{J}\mathbf{P}\left(S_{k-1}\le -\frac{B}{2}\right)+\frac{2J}{B}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\big[(\log\xi)^+\big]\\ &\le \frac{\varepsilon}{K_L},\end{aligned}$$

by choosing $B = B(J, L, T, \varepsilon)$ large enough. Finally we have

$$\mathbb{Q}\Big(\exists k\in[1,J]:\xi(w_k)\ge \mathrm{e}^{B+V(w_{k-1})},\ \min_{1\le j\le k} V(w_j)\ge -c_4,\ F_n,\ \tau_{\zeta_n}^{(2,w_n)}>n\Big)\le \varepsilon\,\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha_n}. \tag{6.14}$$

By combining (6.13) and (6.14), we get (6.8) and therefore complete the proof of Lemma 6.1. □

References

[1] Addario-Berry, L. and Reed, B. (2009). Minima in branching random walks. *Ann. Probab.*, **37**, 1044–1079.

[2] Aïdékon, E. (2013). Convergence in law of the minimum of a branching random walk. *Ann. Probab.* **41**, 1115–1766.

[3] Alsmeyer, G., Biggins, J.D., and Meiners, M. (2012). The functional equation of the smoothing transformation. *Ann. Probab.*, **140**, 2069–2105.

[4] Attia N. and Barral J. (2014). Hausdorff and packing spectra, large deviations, and free energy for branching random walks in $\mathbb{R}^d$. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **331**, 139–187.

[5] Barral, J., Kupiainen, A., Nikula, M., Saksman, E. and Webb, C. (2014). Critical Mandelbrot Cascades. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **325**, 685–711.

[6] Barral, J., Rhodes, R. and Vargas, V. (2012). Limiting laws of supercritical branching random walks. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I* **350**, 535–538.

[7] Bérard, J. and Maillard, P. (2013+). The limiting process of N-particle branching random walk with polynomial tails. (preprint, available at arXiv:1311.1488v1)

[8] Biggins, J.D. (1976). The first- and last-birth problems for a multitype age-dependent branching process. *Adv. Appl. Probab.* **8**, 446–459.

[9] Biggins, J.D. (1977). Martingale convergence in the branching random walk. *J. Appl. Probab.* **14**, 25–37.

[10] Biggins, J.D. (1992). Uniform convergence of martingales in the branching random walk. *Ann. Probab.* **20**, 137-151.

[11] Biggins, J.D. and Kyprianou, A.E. (1997). Seneta-Heyde norming in the branching random walk. *Ann. Probab.* **25**, 337–360.

[12] Biggins, J.D. and Kyprianou, A.E. (2004). Measure change in multitype branching. *Adv. Appl. Probab.* **36**, 544–581.

[13] Biggins, J.D. and Kyprianou, A.E. (2005). The smoothing transform: the boundary case. *Elec. J. Probab.* **10**, 609–631.

[14] Borovkov, A. A. and Borovkov, K. A. (2008). *Asymptotic analysis of random walks. Heavy-tailed distributions.* Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, 118. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

[15] Bramson, M.D. (1978). Maximal displacement of branching Brownian motion. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **31**, 531–581.

[16] Bramson, M., Ding, J. and Zeitouni, O. (2014+). Convergence in law of the maximum of nonlattice branching random walk. (preprint) available at http://arxiv.org/abs/1404.3423

[17] Bramson, M.D. and Zeitouni, O. (2009). Tightness for a family of recursion equations. *Ann. Probab.,* **37**, 615–653

[18] Chauvin, B., Rouault, A. and Wakolbinger, A. (1991). Growing conditioned trees. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.* **39**, 117–130.

[19] Chen, X.X. (2014+). A necessary and sufficient condition for the non-trivial limit of the derivative martingale in a branching random walk. (preprint, available at http://arxiv.org/abs/1402.5864).

[20] Collet, P. and Koukiou, F. (1992). Large deviations for multiplicative chaos. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **147**, 329–342.

[21] Denisov, D., Dieker, A. B. and Shneer, V. (2008). Large deviations for random walks under subexponentiality: the big-jump domain. *Ann. Probab.* **36** no. 5, 1946–1991.

[22] Derrida, B. and H., Spohn (1988). Polymers on disordered trees, spin glasses and traveling waves. *J. Stat. Phys.*, **51**, 817–840.

[23] Durrett, R. (1983). Maxima of branching random walks, *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie verw. Gebiete* **62**, 165–170.

[24] Durrett, R., Liggett, T. (1983). Fixed points of the smoothing transformation, Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete, **64**, 275-301.

[25] Feller, W. (1971). *An Introduction to Probability Theory and its Applications.* Vol. II. Second edition. Wiley, New York.

[26] Gantert, N. (2000). The maximum of a branching random walk with semiexponential increments. *Annals of Probability* **28**, No 3, 1219–1229.

[27] Gut, A. (2009). *Stopped random walks. Limit theorems and applications.* Second edition. Springer, New York.

[28] Hammersley, J.M. (1974). Postulates for subadditive processes. *Ann. Probab.* **2**, 652–680.

[29] Hu, Y. and Shi, Z. (2009). Minimal position and critical martingale convergence in branching random walks, and directed polymers on disordered trees. *Ann. Probab.*, **37**, 742–789.

[30] Kahane, J.-P. and Peyrière, J. (1976). Sur certaines martingales de B. Mandelbrot. *Adv. Math.*, **22**, 131–145.

[31] Kallenberg, O. (1976). *Random Measures.* Academie-Verlag, Berlin.

[32] Kingman, J.F.C. (1975). The first birth problem for an age-dependent branching process. *Ann. Probab.* **3**, 790–801.

[33] Kyprianou, A. (1998). Slow variations and uniqueness of solutions to the functional equations in the branching random walk, J. Appl. Probab., **35**, 795–802

[34] Kyprianou, A. (2000). Martingale Convergence and the Stopped Branching Random Walk. *Probab. Th. Re. Fields*, **116**, 405–419.

[35] Liu, Q.S. (1998). Fixed points of a generalized smoothing transformation and applications to the branching random walk. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.*, **30**, 85–112.

[36] Liu, Q.S. (2000). On generalized multiplicative cascades. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.* **86**, 263–286.

[37] Lyons, R. (1997). A simple path to Biggins' martingale convergence for branching random walk. In: *Classical and Modern Branching Processes* (Eds.: K.B. Athreya and P. Jagers). *IMA Volumes in Mathematics and its Applications* **84**, 217–221. Springer, New York.

[38] Lyons, R., Pemantle, R. and Peres, Y. (1995). Conceptual proofs of $L \log L$ criteria for mean behavior of branching processes. *Ann. Probab.* **23**, 1125–1138.

[39] Madaule, Th. (2011+). Convergence in law for the branching random walk seen from its tip. (Preprint, http://arxiv.org/abs/1107.2543).

[40] Mandelbrot, B.B. (1974). Multiplications aléatoires itérées et distributions invariantes par moyennes pondérées. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris* **278**, 289–292 and 355–358.

[41] Morters P., Ortgiese M. (2008). Minimal supporting subtrees for the free energy of polymers on disordered trees. *J. Math. Phys.* **49**, no. 12, 125203, 21 pp.

[42] Molchan, G.M. (1996). Scaling exponents and multifractal dimensions for independent random cascades. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **179**, 681–702.

[43] Ossiander, M., Waymire, E.C. (2000). Statistical estimation for multiplicative cascades. *Ann. Stat.* **28**, 1–29.

[44] Petrov, V.V. (1995). *Limit Theorems of Probability Theory.* Clarendon Press, Oxford.

[45] Shi, Z. (2014+). *Branching random walks.* École d'été de Saint-Flour XLII (2012), in preparation.

[46] Stone, C. (1965). A local limit theorem for nonlattice multidimensional distribution functions. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, Vol. **36** 546–551.

[47] Vatutin, V. and Wachtel, V. (2009). Local probabilities for random walks conditioned to stay positive. *Probab. Th. Rel. Fields.* **143** 177–217.

[48] Waymire, E.C. and Williams, S.C. (1996). A cascade decomposition theory with applications to Markov and exchangeable cascades. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **348**, 585–632.

[49] Webb, C. (2011). Exact asymptotics of the freezing transitions of a logarithmically correlated random energy model. *J. Stat. Phys.* **145**, 1595–1619.